

DISCOVERY OF SANSKRIT TREASURES

CLASSICAL SANSKRIT LITERATURE

SATYA VRAT SHASTRI

**DISCOVERY OF
SANSKRIT TREASURES**

DISCOVERY OF
SANSKRIT TREASURES

**DISCOVERY OF
SANSKRIT TREASURES**

VOLUME III

CLASSICAL SANSKRIT LITERATURE

Satya Vrat Shastri

HONORARY PROFESSOR, SPECIAL CENTRE FOR SANSKRIT STUDIES
JAWAHARLAL NEHRU UNIVERSITY

FORMERLY PROFESSOR AND HEAD, DEPARTMENT OF SANSKRIT
UNIVERSITY OF DELHI

EX-VICE-CHANCELLOR

SHRI JAGANNATH SANSKRIT UNIVERSITY, PURI (ORISSA)



YASH PUBLICATIONS

Published by
YASH PUBLICATIONS
X/909, Chand Mohalla,
Gandhi Nagar, Delhi-110 031
Phone : 22822514, 9910189445
Email : yash_publication@hotmail.com

© Author

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording or otherwise, without written permission from the author and publisher.

Revised Edition : 2009

ISBN : 978-81-89537-10-5 [set]

Price : Rs. 5000.00 [Set]

Printed by :
Vikas Computer & Printers
Naveen Shahdara, Delhi-110032

Contents

I. Mahimabhaṭṭa's Criticism of the Concept of Dhvani	7
II. Karuṇa Rasa in Sanskrit Literature	10
III. Yogavāsiṣṭha Studies	
1. The Date of the <i>Yogavāsiṣṭha</i>	20
2. The Plan of the <i>Yogavāsiṣṭha</i>	42
3. Descriptive Poetry in the <i>Yogavāsiṣṭha</i>	46
4. The Anyoktis in the <i>Yogavāsiṣṭha</i>	57
IV. Kālidāsa Studies	
1. The <i>Kumārasambhava</i> —Its Genuine Portion	67
2. <i>Yajñas</i> (Sacrifices) in Kālidāsa	71
3. Kālidāsa's Ṛsis	85
4. Kālidāsa's Life-View	108
V. <i>Mṛcchakaṭika</i> —A Reassessment	134
VI. The Story of Udayana and Vāsavadattā	
through the Ages	157
VII. A Survey of Sanskrit Dūtakāvyas	169
VIII. Sanskrit Language and Literature:	
A Study in Environment	237
IX. Contribution of Muslims to Sanskrit	250
X. Some Peripheral Literature:	
Lexicography and Medicine	279

Contents

1	I. Introduction: A Study of the Concept of Karma
10	II. Karma as a Moral Law
20	III. Karma and the Law of Cause and Effect
30	IV. Karma and the Law of Karma
40	V. Karma and the Law of Karma
50	VI. Karma and the Law of Karma
60	VII. Karma and the Law of Karma
70	VIII. Karma and the Law of Karma
80	IX. Karma and the Law of Karma
90	X. Karma and the Law of Karma
100	XI. Karma and the Law of Karma
110	XII. Karma and the Law of Karma
120	XIII. Karma and the Law of Karma
130	XIV. Karma and the Law of Karma
140	XV. Karma and the Law of Karma
150	XVI. Karma and the Law of Karma
160	XVII. Karma and the Law of Karma
170	XVIII. Karma and the Law of Karma
180	XIX. Karma and the Law of Karma
190	XX. Karma and the Law of Karma
200	XXI. Karma and the Law of Karma
210	XXII. Karma and the Law of Karma
220	XXIII. Karma and the Law of Karma
230	XXIV. Karma and the Law of Karma
240	XXV. Karma and the Law of Karma
250	XXVI. Karma and the Law of Karma
260	XXVII. Karma and the Law of Karma
270	XXVIII. Karma and the Law of Karma
280	XXIX. Karma and the Law of Karma
290	XXX. Karma and the Law of Karma
300	XXXI. Karma and the Law of Karma
310	XXXII. Karma and the Law of Karma
320	XXXIII. Karma and the Law of Karma
330	XXXIV. Karma and the Law of Karma
340	XXXV. Karma and the Law of Karma
350	XXXVI. Karma and the Law of Karma
360	XXXVII. Karma and the Law of Karma
370	XXXVIII. Karma and the Law of Karma
380	XXXIX. Karma and the Law of Karma
390	XL. Karma and the Law of Karma
400	XLI. Karma and the Law of Karma
410	XLII. Karma and the Law of Karma
420	XLIII. Karma and the Law of Karma
430	XLIV. Karma and the Law of Karma
440	XLV. Karma and the Law of Karma
450	XLVI. Karma and the Law of Karma
460	XLVII. Karma and the Law of Karma
470	XLVIII. Karma and the Law of Karma
480	XLIX. Karma and the Law of Karma
490	L. Karma and the Law of Karma
500	LXI. Karma and the Law of Karma
510	LXII. Karma and the Law of Karma
520	LXIII. Karma and the Law of Karma
530	LXIV. Karma and the Law of Karma
540	LXV. Karma and the Law of Karma
550	LXVI. Karma and the Law of Karma
560	LXVII. Karma and the Law of Karma
570	LXVIII. Karma and the Law of Karma
580	LXIX. Karma and the Law of Karma
590	LXX. Karma and the Law of Karma
600	LXXI. Karma and the Law of Karma
610	LXXII. Karma and the Law of Karma
620	LXXIII. Karma and the Law of Karma
630	LXXIV. Karma and the Law of Karma
640	LXXV. Karma and the Law of Karma
650	LXXVI. Karma and the Law of Karma
660	LXXVII. Karma and the Law of Karma
670	LXXVIII. Karma and the Law of Karma
680	LXXIX. Karma and the Law of Karma
690	LXXX. Karma and the Law of Karma
700	LXXXI. Karma and the Law of Karma
710	LXXXII. Karma and the Law of Karma
720	LXXXIII. Karma and the Law of Karma
730	LXXXIV. Karma and the Law of Karma
740	LXXXV. Karma and the Law of Karma
750	LXXXVI. Karma and the Law of Karma
760	LXXXVII. Karma and the Law of Karma
770	LXXXVIII. Karma and the Law of Karma
780	LXXXIX. Karma and the Law of Karma
790	LXXXX. Karma and the Law of Karma
800	LXXXXI. Karma and the Law of Karma
810	LXXXXII. Karma and the Law of Karma
820	LXXXXIII. Karma and the Law of Karma
830	LXXXXIV. Karma and the Law of Karma
840	LXXXXV. Karma and the Law of Karma
850	LXXXXVI. Karma and the Law of Karma
860	LXXXXVII. Karma and the Law of Karma
870	LXXXXVIII. Karma and the Law of Karma
880	LXXXXIX. Karma and the Law of Karma
890	LXXXXX. Karma and the Law of Karma
900	LXXXXXI. Karma and the Law of Karma
910	LXXXXXII. Karma and the Law of Karma
920	LXXXXXIII. Karma and the Law of Karma
930	LXXXXXIV. Karma and the Law of Karma
940	LXXXXXV. Karma and the Law of Karma
950	LXXXXXVI. Karma and the Law of Karma
960	LXXXXXVII. Karma and the Law of Karma
970	LXXXXXVIII. Karma and the Law of Karma
980	LXXXXXIX. Karma and the Law of Karma
990	LXXXXXX. Karma and the Law of Karma
1000	LXXXXXXI. Karma and the Law of Karma

I

Mahimabhaṭṭa's Criticism of the Concept of Dhvani

Though the concept of Dhvani had evoked wide acceptance at the hands of Ālaṅkārikas, there have been some, they are, however, far smaller in number, who have voiced their opposition to it. Rājānaka Mahimabhaṭṭa is one of them. In the first chapter of his *Vyaktiviveka* he devotes considerable space to the criticism of Dhvani and the enunciation of his view which regards it as redundant; the purpose of it being adequately served through the primary power of Denotation, Abhidhā. Mahimabhaṭṭa is Abhidhāvādin. His view may be briefly set forth as follows: There is no power in a word except Abhidhā. Lakṣaṇā resides in the sense and not in the word. In the expression *gaur vāhikāḥ*, the identification between the ox and the resident of Vāhikas is known through inference, *anumāna*. Similarly is known the situation of a hamlet on the bank of the river Gaṅgā on account of the impossibility of its being located on the flowing current of water. This inference, *anumiti*, according to him, is different from the *anumiti*, inference, of the Naiyāyikas; it is *kāvyaṇumiti*. Suggestion being a secondary sense comes within the purview of the *kāvyaṇumiti*. In expression where secondary sense is understood, it is not due to suggestion; it is due to *kāvyaṇumiti*. Now, all these are familiar points of criticism. There is, however, one point where Mahimabhaṭṭa's criticism of the Dhvani School is characterized by freshness of approach. He tries to cut at the very root of it. It is maintained by the Ālaṅkārikas that the use of

the word Dhvani on their part is inspired by the similarity of its function in the Vyākaraṇaśāstra, *vyañjakatvasāmyāt*¹. In the Vyākaraṇaśāstra the relationship between Dhvani and Sphoṭa is that of *vyañjaka*, manifestor, and *vyaṅgya*, manifested. This relationship is similar to the one between *ghaṭa* and *pradīpa*, the jar and the lamp. Just as a lamp manifests a jar but while manifesting it manifests itself too, similarly does Dhvani manifest Sphoṭa while manifesting itself too. In other words between Dhvani and Sphoṭa there is the relationship of *yaugapadya*, simultaneity. That is the import of the *ghaṭapradīpanyāya*. It is at this Mahimabhaṭṭa has launched his attack. There is no simultaneity here. There is sequence here too. Says he:

*ata eva (kramasya sulakṣatvāt) śrūyamāṇānām
śabdānām dhvanivyapadeśyānām antahsanniveśinaś
ca sphoṭābhimatasyārthasya vyaṅgyavyañjakabhāvo
na sambhavaḥ itī vyañjakatvasāmyād yaḥ śabdārthāt-
mani kāvyē dhvanivyapadeśaḥ so 'py anupapannaḥ*²

The moment the concept of *yaugapadya*, simultaneity, is taken out, the whole concept of Dhvani, based as it is on the similarity of function of Dhvani in Vyākaraṇa and Alaṅkāraśāstras, falls. If in the Vyākaraṇaśāstra it can be shown that there is no relationship of *vyañjaka* and *vyaṅgya* between Dhvani and Sphoṭa which would mean that Dhvani is not *vyañjaka*, the use of the word Dhvani in Alaṅkāraśāstra on the similarity of its function in Vyākaraṇaśāstra, *vyañjakatva-sāmyād*, would lose its point. With the sequence, *krama*, existing in Dhvani and Sphoṭa they evidently cannot stand in the relationship of *vyañjaka* and *vyaṅgya*; they would instead have to stand in the relationship of *gamaka* and *gamyā*. If we accept Dhvani as *gamaka* or *anumāpaka* in Vyākaraṇaśāstra we shall have to accept it as such in Alaṅkāraśāstra. In that case Dhvani will lose its *raison de etre* and would come to be identified with *anumiti* (*dhvaner anumitāv antarbhāvaḥ*). Now, this is a criticism which is of far reaching significance not only for the Ālaṅkārikas but also for the Vaiyākaraṇas who have all along accepted the relationship of *vyañjaka* and *vyaṅgya* between Dhvani and Sphoṭa.

With his informed criticism Mahimabhaṭṭa has created a problem for the rhetoricians and the grammarians.

REFERENCES

1. *budhair vaiyākaraṇaiḥ pradhānabhūtasphoṭarūpavyaṅgya-
vyañjakasya śabdasya dhvanir iti vyavahāraḥ kṛtaḥ।
tatas tanmatānusāribhir anyair api nyagbhāvitavācyavyaṅgya-
vyañjanakṣamasya śabdārthayugalasya.*
Kāvya prakāśa, I. 4.
2. *Vyaktiviveka*, Chowkhambha Sanskrit Series, Varanasi, 1936, p. 57.

II

Karuṇa Rasa in Sanskrit Literature

The entire creation is made up of opposites: *dvandvātmikā sṛṣṭiḥ*. One of these opposites is happiness and sorrow. Both are inter-related. There can be no happiness without sorrow. The happiness presupposes the existence of sorrow. If it were not so, the very realization of happiness would not be possible.

It is the peculiarity of poetry that whatever produces unhappiness in real life comes to produce in poetry happiness or joy. Poetry imparts the character of *alaukikatva* to the day to day experiences of life. Their description at the hands of the poet elevates them to a state where they cease to be the ordinary day to day experiences. In poetry they assume a peculiar form which enables them to provide joy to readers or listeners. That is the spirit of Rasa that had been grasped by the thinkers and critics centuries past. Among human beings there are certain permanent emotions which are given the name of *Sthāyibhāvas*. It is these when bestirred by certain phenomena turn into Rasas and come to be relished or enjoyed. Of all the Rasas, Karuṇa or Pathos touches the heart quick, pierces the vitals, gives out a jolt. In Erotic there is a kind of serenity. In Heroic the enthusiasm dominates. In Fierce and Terrible it is the fear which grips but it is in Pathos, Karuṇa that heart melts: *prāyaḥ sarvo bhavati karuṇāvṛttir ārdraṅtarātmā*¹. The mind is shattered: *bhavati manobhaṅgaḥ*. The limbs sink: *sīdanti gātrāṇi*. Interestingly, the literal meaning of the word *viśāda* is sinking. It is natural for human beings to avoid such situations, to get over them. This is what explains the absence of tragedy in Sanskrit. With all bad

situations, the sorrows and sufferings, one comes out at the end, happy and contented. That further explains as to why in the entire corpus of Sanskrit literature there are few works which have Karuṇa as the principal sentiment even though they have powerful content of it in certain situations. The idea is that one may not have to remain in perpetual state of despondency and melancholy or that the state of despondency or melancholy are not to be taken to undermine the very fibre of a person.

While enumerating the number of Rasas, Bharata gives the third place to Karuṇa. The *Nāṭyaśāstra* mentions eight Rasas, such as:

*śṛṅgārahāsyakaruṇaraudravīrabhayānakāḥ |
bībhatsādbhūtasamjñau cety aṣṭau nāṭye rasāḥ smṛtāḥ ||*²

To these eight Rasas of Bharata, later poeticians like Udbhaṭa and others have added other Rasas like Śānta, Preyas and Bhakti. Viśvanātha has considered Vātsalya too as Rasa. But no poetician has ever changed the serial of the number of Rasas given by Bharata. Its position in the list of the Rasas shows its importance. The famous Sūtra of Bharata: *vibhāvānubhāvasaṅcārī-samyogād rasanīṣpattiḥ*³ propounds the whole process of aesthetic experience or *rasānubhūti*. For considering any Rasa, its *Sthāyibhāva* is first to be taken into consideration.

In the case of Karuṇa it is Śoka which is its *Sthāyibhāva*:

*ratir hāsaś ca śokaś ca krodhotsāhau bhayaṁ tathā |
jugupsā vismayaś ceti sthāyibhāvāḥ prakīrtitāḥ ||*⁴

Explaining Śoka Viśvanātha mentions that when "the *citta* becomes despondent by the destruction of the cherished it becomes *śoka* : *iṣṭanāśādibhiś cetovaiklavyaṁ śokaśabdabhāk*."⁵ As the *Sthāyī* is the destruction of the cherished, so we find the definition of Karuṇa incorporating the same *iṣṭanāśa* with one more addition of receiving the uncherished: *iṣṭanāśād anīṣṭāpteh karuṇākhyo raso bhavet*.⁶ It is quite evident from this (definition) that Karuṇa is an experience of Pathos. The human life is full of it. This element of Pathos is further stressed when Viśvanātha assigns it the colour of *kapota* (pigeon), and mentions Yama as

its presiding deity: *dhīraḥ kapotavarṇo 'yaṁ kathito yamadaivataḥ*.⁷ Kapota is taken as an ill omen. Yama is the god of death. Both in their association with Karuṇa lend it a sense of deprivation that a man experiences.

Here would arise a question as to whether Karuṇa can at all be called Rasa when it gives an experience of sorrow, for in that case it will counter the definition of Rasa which is explained as continuous happiness and is likened to the experience of Brahman:

*sattvodrekād akhaṇḍasvaprakāśānandacinmayah |
vedyāntarasparsāśūnyo brahmāsvādasahodarah ||*⁸

To this the *Sāhityadarpaṇa* gives a fitting reply. According to it Rasa does not belong to empirical world, the pain of the empirical world is not to be experienced through it: *lokottaracamatkāraprāṇaḥ kaiścit pramāṭrbhiḥ*⁹. Viśvanātha maintains that the *sahṛdayas* realised happiness and not sorrow by experiencing Karuṇa etc.:

*karuṇādvāpī rase jāyate yat param sukham |
sacetasām anubhavaḥ pramāṇam tatra kevalam ||*¹⁰

He further strengthens his argument by the logic that the people would not take to Karuṇa if they were not to derive pleasure out of it: *kiñ ca teṣu yadā duḥkham na ko 'pi syāt tadunmukhaḥ*¹¹. If that be otherwise, works like the *Rāmāyaṇa* would only bring unhappiness: *tathā rāmāyaṇādīnām bhavitā duḥkhaḥetutā*.¹² Thus, though Karuṇa means *iṣṭanāśa*, it gives the experience of the same aesthetic joy that is relished under other Rasas.

According to Sanskrit Poetics there is no wrong in depicting Karuṇa as the principal Rasa in a Kāvya. The *Sāhityadarpaṇa* holds the view that Karuṇa is the principal Rasa in the Aṅka form of Rūpakas and the Ullāpya form of Uparūpakas:

*utsṛṣṭikāṅka ekāṅko netāraḥ prākṛtā guṇāḥ |
raso 'tra karuṇaḥ sthāyī bahustrīnaradevitam ||*¹³

*śilpakāṅgair yutam hāsyāśṛṅgārakarūṇai rasaḥ |
ullāpyam bahusaṅgrāmamasragūṭamanoharam ||*¹⁴

Besides Vyāyoga and Īhāmṛga forms of Rūpakas also have Karuṇa as their principal Rasa as the *miśravṛtta* type of dramas.

But with all these possibilities for Karuṇa it does not take one long to notice that the Sanskrit literature does not have Kāvyaś or dramas which have Karuṇa as their principal Rasa, though the Greek literature is full of them. This may be traced to a principle maintained in Sanskrit Poetics that either Śṛṅgāra or Vīra could be the principal Rasa in a poetic or dramatic composition:

*eka eva bhaved aṅgī śṛṅgāro vīra eva vā |
aṅgam anye rasāḥ sarve kāryo nirvahāṇe 'dbhutaḥ ||*¹⁵

But it does not mean that Karuṇa does not exist in Sanskrit works. Though in the later classical literature it is not made principal Rasa often, yet its existence can be traced right to the period of the Vedic literature. In the hymns of Vasiṣṭha to Varuṇa one marks its depiction:

*kim āga āsa varuṇa jyeṣṭham yat
stotāraṁ jighāṁsasi sakhāyam |
pra tan me voco dūḷabha svadhāvo
'va tv anenā namasā tura iyām ||*¹⁶

Vasiṣṭha here cries fervently to regain the favour of Varuṇa. The most eminent example of Karuṇa in earlier Sanskrit literature is the *Rāmāyaṇa*. Ānandavardhana had rightly pointed out that in the *Rāmāyaṇa*, the Karuṇa Rasa has been woven by declaring that sorrow has taken the turn of a stanza: *Rāmāyaṇe karuṇo hi rasah—svayam adikavinā sūcitah śokaḥ ślokatvam āgata ityevaṁvādinā*¹⁷.

The *Rāmāyaṇa* mentions in the second canto of the Bālakāṇḍa that the first śloka uttered by Vālmiki came out of his śoka:

*śokārttasya pravṛtto me śloko bhavatu nānyathā*¹⁸.

This has been noted by poets and scholars afterwards. Kālidāsa mentions in the *Raghuvamśa* that the śoka of Vālmiki became śloka after witnessing the sorrow of the crane:

*niśāda vidhāṇajadarśanotthaḥ ślokatvam āpadyata yasya
śokaḥ ||*¹⁹

Ānandavardhana echoes it when he says: *krauñcadvandva-viyogotthaḥ śokaḥ ślokatvam āgataḥ*.²⁰ In fact, Karuṇa underlies the whole story-structure of the *Rāmāyaṇa*, the Ādikāvya of the Sanskrit literature. The very fact that the *Rāmāyaṇa* came into being out of the grief of a sensitive heart touched by the cries of the female companion of a bird pierced by an arrow of a hunter:

*mā niṣāda pratiṣṭhām tvam agamaḥ śāśvatīḥ samāḥ |
yat krauñcamithunād ekam avadhīḥ kāmamohitam ||*²¹

shows the impact of Pathos. It is not an accident that one of the greatest of the creations of mankind had come into being out of shock: *śokaḥ ślokatvam āgataḥ*. True it is that "our sweetest songs are those that tell of saddest thought". The *śoka* of the *Rāmāyaṇa* has remained a model for the later writers and one hears the echoes of the great epic in the later literature. More than half of the Ayodhyā Kāṇḍa of the *Rāmāyaṇa* is full of *śoka* which finds its epitome in the writhing pain of Daśaratha at the exile of Rāma:

*hā rāghava mahābāho hā mamāyāsanāśana |
hā pītṛpriya me nātha hā mamāsi gataḥ sutaḥ ||
hā kausalye na paśyāmi hā sumitre tapasvini |
hā nṛṣamse mamāmitre kaikeyi kulapāṁsani ||*²²

The cry achieves the fineness of the highest Kāvya in Araṇya Kāṇḍa where Rāma cries out for Sītā: *na tv ahaṁ tvāṁ vinā sīte jīveyaṁ hi kathañcana*²³ and tells Lakṣmaṇa of his *śoka*:

*sarvaṁ tu duḥkham mama lakṣmaṇedaṁ
śāntaṁ śarīre vanam eṭya kleśam |
sītāviyogād punar apy udīrṇam
kāṣṭhair ivāgniḥ sahasopadīptaḥ ||*²⁴

Rāma's towering personality breaks down under the pressure of sorrow in losing Sītā and he cries out like an ordinary man:

*na madvidho duṣkṛtakarmakārī manye dvitīyo 'sti
vasundharāyām |
śokānuśoko hi paramparāyām mām eti bhindan hṛdayam
manaś ca ||*²⁵

He becomes almost senseless and begins to enquire the whereabouts of Sītā from plants, animals and even the wind:

*lokeṣu sarveṣu na nāsti kiñcid
yat te na nityaṁ viditaṁ bhaved tat।
śamsasva vāyo kulapālīnūṁ tām
mṛtā hatā vā pathi vartate vā।²⁶*

Karuṇa so minutely and elaborately described by Vālmiki in the *Rāmāyaṇa* achieves the highest pitch in the *Uttararāmacarita* of Bhavabhūti. The condition of remorseful Rāma burning within from sorrow on account of separation from Sītā whom he had himself banished is likened by him to *puṭapāka* (slow cooking within):

*anirbhinno gabhīratvād antargūḍhaghanavyathah।
puṭapākapratikāśo rāmasya karuṇo rasaḥ।²⁷*

Torn between his royal duties and attachment to his wife with whom he had spent the best years of his life, he represents a pathetic figure. Public calumny makes him forsake Sītā whom he knew to be as pure as any woman could be. She had well been tested of her purity in fire before his very eyes. To forsake her required a sacrifice of him which reduced him in the process to a mental wreck. His duties he did though all the time haunted by the thoughts of his beloved. A visit to Pañcavaṭī put him back to old days of happy union with her. He was not able to stand that and fell into unconsciousness again and again evoking pity for him even in the heart of Sānumatī, the friend of Sītā who was following his movements invisible. All the misery, all the suffering Rāma was undergoing was his own doing. And that is what takes the Pathos in his character to the highest limit. Rightly is he made to say in the *Uttararāmacarita*: *svayaṁ kṛtvā tyāgaṁ vilapanavinodo 'py asulabhah*²⁸. In creating a character like Rāma and placing him in situations where he could have little sympathy for himself, Bhavabhūti ascended heights in depicting Karuṇa achieved by very few in the entire range of Sanskrit literature prompting the critics to say: *kāruṇyaṁ bhavabhūtir eva tanute*, Bhavabhūti alone can create Pathos.

In the *Rāmāyaṇa* Karuṇa is the principal Rasa, in the *Uttararāmacarita* it is the Rasa, other Rasas being just its

different manifestations which get merged in it in their final existence:

*eko rasaḥ karuṇa eva nimittabhedād bhinnāḥ prthak prthag
ivāśrayate vivartāni*²⁹

Bhavabhūti in his description has made even the stones cry and the rocks break:

*api grāvā rodity api dalati vajrasya hṛdayam*³⁰

The anguish of Rāma is best expressed when he tries to compose himself and says:

*devyā śūnyasya jagato dvādaśaḥ parivatsaraḥ
pranaṣtam iva nāmāpi na ca rāmo na jīvati*³¹

Besides the story of Rāma we find Karuṇa in the *Ūrubhaṅga* of Bhāsa where Duryodhana is shown crying in his death bed as he witnesses his helpless sons and widowed wives:

*pūrvam na jānāmi gadābhighāta-
rujām idānīm tu samarthayāmi
yan me prakāśikṛtamūrdhajāni
raṇam praviṣṭāny avarodhanāni*³²

One of the best examples of Karuṇa is found in the famous *Meghadūta* where the Yakṣa becomes mad in love and loses his sense to distinguish the sentient from the non-sentient:

*kāmārtitā hi prakṛtikṛpaṇāś cetanācetanēṣu*³³

and at the sight of the clouds has tears welling up:

*antarbāṣpaś ciram anucaro rājarājasya dadhyau*³⁴

Another example of Karuṇa we find in the story of Puṇḍarīka and Mahāśvetā:

*hā hā kim idam upanātam iti muktārtanādā hā amba,
hā tāta, hā sakhya iti vyāharantī hā nātha
jīvitānibandhana ācakṣva kva mām ekākinīm
āśaraṇām vimucya yāsi, prccha taralikām tvaikṛte
mayā yā 'nubhūtā 'vasthā yugasahasrāyamāṇāḥ
kṛcchreṇa nīto divasaḥ*³⁵

Karuṇa is variously employed to rouse either sympathy in the heart of the *sahridayas* or to give them a feel of it as can be seen

in the cries of the Gopīs at the time of Kṛṣṇa's departure from Vṛndāvana to Mathurā as depicted in the *Śrīmadbhāgavata*:

*aho vidhātas tava na kvaśid dayā
samyojya maitṛyaṁ praṇayena dehinaḥ |
tāṁś cākṛtārthān viyunaikṣya apārthakaṁ
vikṛḍitaṁ te 'rbhakaceṣṭitaṁ yathā |*³⁶

Here Karuṇa can very well elevate one to the realization of devotion which is considered as Rasa in the *Ujjvalaṇīlamanī*.

Of other Sanskrit works which have descriptions of pathetic situations mention may be made of the *Raghuvamśa* of Kālidāsa which describes the lamentation of Aja at the loss of Indumatī. The king is unable to understand as to how the Pārijāta garland could kill his consort. He falls unconscious. He is not able to withstand the tragedy that had struck him. In the *Kumārasambhava*, the lamentation of Rati at the burning of Kāma (by Lord Śiva with fire from the third eye at the former's indiscretion) is very touching and brings before the readers the image of a forlorn lady who is compared to smoking wick. In the *Naiṣadhīyacarita* of Śrīharṣa, there is description in the first Canto itself of a golden swan which was caught by King Nala on the bank of a lake. The swan feels sorry for its mother and its consort who had just had delivery. The words of the swan betray the great upsurge of emotion in its heart, the emotion which could even move the king to shed tears and to release it.

The entire *dūtakāvya* literature of Sanskrit running well over to a hundred texts is a fine specimen of Karuṇa depicting as it does the separation of a lover from his beloved or vice versa, with all the memories of the past union crowding in and heightening the impact of loneliness.

The story of Karuṇa will never come to an end without noticing the *Abhijñānaśākuntala* of Kālidāsa where in the Fourth Act at the time of departure of Śākuntalā for her husband's home, Kaṇva feels his mind stilled and voice choked. The foster father and the foster daughter are hardly able to control their emotions. The entire scene of the departure of Śākuntalā breathes sadness. The whole of the penance grove reflects the sorrow of coming separation.

*Priyamvadā-na kevalam tapovanavirahakātarā
sakhy eva. tvayopasthitaviyogasya tapovanasyāpi
tāvat samavasthām prekṣasva.*³⁷

Śakuntalā breaks down while she takes leave of her childhood girl friends, the creeper Vanajyotsnā which she had tended all along and the young fawn which she had brought up with fostering care. Not in her own self her gait becomes uneven:

*mārge padāni khalu te viṣamībhavanti*³⁸

Karuṇa again erupts in the work (the *Abhijñānaśākuntala*) in the Fifth Act when Śakuntalā is repudiated by Duṣyanta and is forsaken by her escorts, Śārṅgarava, Śāradvata and Gautamī. A helpless lady with none to look for succour she throws up her arms and begins to cry:

*bāhūtkṣepam kranditum ca pravṛtā*³⁹

By far the most touching description of Karuṇa found in the works of Kālidāsa is met with in the *Raghuvamśa* at the time of the exile of Sītā. As Lakṣmaṇa leaves her in the jungle, she cries out like a Kurarī:

*sā muktakaṇṭham vyasanātibhārāc
cakranda vignā kurarīva bhūyaḥ*⁴⁰

It were her cries that had brought Vālmiki to her:

*tām abhyagacchad ruditānusārī
kaviḥ kuśedhmāharaṇāya yātaḥ*⁴¹

As can be seen from the above some of the finest poetry in Sanskrit is that which has an element of Karuṇa in it. If its appeal to human heart, its melting, were to be the touch-stone for the effectiveness of any Rasa, one may have to agree with Bhavabhūti in accepting Karuṇa to be the only Rasa: *eko rasaḥ karuṇa eva*.⁴²

REFERENCES

1. *Meghadūta*, Uttaramegha, verse 32, ed. Gopal Narayan & Co., Bombay, 1894.
2. *Nāṭyaśāstra*, VI. 15; *Sāhityadarpaṇa*, III. 182.

3. *Nāṭyaśāstra*, Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office, Banaras, 1985, p. 71.
4. *Sāhityadarpaṇa*, III. 175; *Nāṭyaśāstra*, VI, 17.
5. *Sāhityadarpaṇa*, III. 177.
6. *ibid.*, III. 222.
7. *ibid.*
8. *ibid.*, III. 2.
9. *ibid.*, III.3.
10. *ibid.*, III, 4-5.
11. *ibid.*, 111.6
12. *ibid.*, III. 5.
13. *ibid.*, VI. 250-1.
14. *ibid.*, VI. 282-3.
15. *ibid.*, VI. 10.
16. *Ṛgveda*, VII. 86.4
17. *Dhvanyāloka*, Karnataka University, Dharwar, 1974, p. 274.
18. *Rāmāyaṇa*, I. 2.18.
19. *Raghuvamśa*, XIV.70.
20. *Dhvanyāloka*, I. 5.
21. *Rāmāyaṇa*, I. 2.15.
22. *ibid.*, II. 64. 75-6.
24. *ibid.*, III. 63.6.
25. *ibid.*, III. 63.3.
26. *ibid.*, III. 63.17.
27. *Uttararāmacarita*, III. 1.
28. *ibid.*, III. 30.
29. *ibid.*, III. 47.
30. *ibid.*, I. 28.
31. *ibid.*, III. 33.
32. verse 38.
33. *Meghadūta*, Pūrvamegha, verse 5.
34. *ibid.*, verse 3.
35. *Kādambarī*, Nirṇaya Sagar Press, Bombay, 1916, p. 308.
36. X.39.19.
37. *Abhijñānaśākuntala*, Sahitya Akademi, New Delhi, 1965, p. 67.
38. *ibid.*, IV. 15.
39. *ibid.*, V. 32.
40. *Raghuvamśa*, XIV. 68.
41. *ibid.*, XIV. 68.

III. YOGAVĀSIṢṬHA STUDIES

1

The Date of the *Yogavāsiṣṭha*

The date of the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* is still a very complicated problem nowhere nearer solution although much has been written on it.¹ Like the dates of most of the earlier Sanskrit works there is no finality about it. Probably there can be none for, this work, as also most other similar works, do not furnish any real clue to their age. The only possible course, and the one generally adopted by researchers is to collect some internal or external data and hazard conjectures thereon. When this is done, arguments are adduced for a particular date and the opponent's views criticized. But there is no end to this process. Again others piece together some other evidence and arrive at a different date. The result is that dates differ and differ widely and the truth remains obscure. That is why an eminent scholar has said that 'all dates in Indian history are pins to be bowled all over again.' Nothing can be truer about the early history of India, whether literary or political.

Among the five scholars who have discussed in detail the problem of the date of the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* we may first mention B.L. Atreya. He thinks 'that the author of the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* cannot be placed before the middle of the 5th century A.D.'² A brief summary of his arguments in favour of this date is given below:

- (i) By the time of Vidyāranya, who belongs to about the first half of the fourteenth century the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* had become an authoritative work because he quotes from it profusely, about 253 times.

- (ii) Gauḍa Abhinanda, a Bengali Brahmin of the 9th century A.D. summarised the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* in 6000 verses. From

this it follows that the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* must be earlier than the 9th century A.D.

- (iii) The *Yogavāsiṣṭha* is a pre-śāṅkaran work, because the treatment of the Advaita philosophy here is rather unsystematic, vague and hazy. The author of the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* is completely ignorant of Śāṅkara and his philosophy. In his *Vivekacūḍāmaṇi* Śāṅkara reproduces a number of verses and ideas from the *Yogavāsiṣṭha*. That he is indebted to the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* and not vice versa is proved by the fact that technical terms that Śāṅkara uses are not found in the *Yogavāsiṣṭha*.
- (iv) A comparison between the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* and the *Māṇḍūkya Kārikās* of Gauḍapāda, who is earlier than Śāṅkara shows that the Advaita philosophy of the *Māṇḍūkya Kārikās* is more akin to the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* than to that of Śāṅkarācārya and his successors.
- (v) There is a positive evidence to the effect that the Advaita philosophy as that of the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* existed before Śāṅkara and Gauḍapāda. Bhavabhūti who belongs to about the 7th century A.D. uses the term *vivarta*. He draws upon the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* and incorporates a number of its verses into his works. This shows that the author of the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* is earlier than the 7th century A.D.
- (vi) A number of verses of the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* recur in the *Vairāgya Śataka* and the *Vākya-padīya*. Now, Bhartṛhari, the author of these works is said to have died in 650 A.D. This means that the author of the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* is earlier than 650 A.D. It cannot be said as to how much earlier he is.

It cannot be argued that the author of the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* has borrowed the verses from the *Vairāgya Śataka* and the *Vākya-padīya*, for the doctrine of Śabda Brahman is not mentioned in the *Yogavāsiṣṭha*. It is impossible to believe that the author of the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* could have omitted to mention it, if he knew it. So the verses or parts thereof which are common to both the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* and

the *Vairāgya-śataka* and the *Vākyapadīya* are borrowed by Bhartṛhari from the *Yogavāsiṣṭha*. Another factor that goes in favour of this stand is that the verse in which the term *vivarta* is found is rare and solitary one in the *Vākyapadīya* while in the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* it forms the main doctrine and there is a very large number of verses in support of it.

- (vii) The author of the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* was acquainted with the philosophy of Buddhism, the Tathatā philosophy of Aśvaghoṣa, (who belongs to the 1st century B.C.) the Śūnyavāda of Nāgārjuna who is placed by scholars in the 2nd century A.D. and the Vijñānavāda of Asaṅga and Vasubandhu. Vasubandhu is believed by scholars to belong to a period between 420-500 A.D. It means the author of the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* could not have lived before the 5th century A.D.
- (viii) The way the whole of the theme of the *Meghadūta* is summarised in the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* in three verses leaves no doubt that the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* is a post- Kālidāsan work. The date that is usually assigned to Kālidāsa is the 5th century A.D. The *Yogavāsiṣṭha*, therefore, cannot be placed before the middle of the 5th century A.D. Its author probably lived at the time of the downfall of the Gupta kings. The philosophy of the work, the descriptions of battles and wars, battle between Vidūratha and Sindhu and the mention of the Hūṇas points to the same conclusion.
- (ix) The conclusion drawn from the evidence cited above is that probably the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* is *anterior to Bhartṛhari and posterior to Kālidāsa*.

From the above summary of the arguments mustered by B.L. Atreya in support of the date suggested by him we find that he mainly rests his arguments, apart from philosophy, on Bhartṛhari and Kālidāsa. It appears that he thinks that both the *Vairāgya-śataka* and the *Vākyapadīya*, belong to the authorship of one and the same Bhartṛhari about

whom he says that he died in 650 A.D. It has now been conclusively proved that Bhartṛhari, the author of the *Śatakas* and Bhartṛhari, the author of the *Vākyapadīya* are two different persons. Itsing seems to have been misled into saying that forty years before he came to India there had died a grammarian named Bhartṛhari. Itsing confused the two Bhartṛharis. For years scholars relying upon the statement of Itsing placed Bhartṛhari, the author of the *Vākyapadīya*, in the 7th century A.D. But latest researches have convincingly shown Bhartṛhari, the author of the *Vākyapadīya* to be different from Bhartṛhari, the author of the *Śatakas* who is said to have wandered seven times between the home and the monastery. The author of the *Vākyapadīya*, is now placed on good grounds in the 3rd century A.D.³ Now if the *Yogavāsiṣṭha*, according to B.L. Atreya's own admission⁴, cannot be assigned to a period earlier than the middle of the 5th century A.D. while the *Vākyapadīya* belongs to the 3rd century A.D., it is the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* which must have borrowed from the *Vākyapadīya* and not vice versa. And the argument that the term *vivarta* occurs in a solitary verse in the *Vākyapadīya* while it occurs in a number of verses in the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* proves just the other thing that the *Vākyapadīya* is earlier and the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* is later, because the philosophical doctrine of *vivarta* is more elaborately treated in the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* than in the *Vākyapadīya* where it is merely alluded to. It is a strange argument that because in the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* *vivarta* is more elaborately treated, it must be earlier. Further, to say that the doctrine of Śabda Brahman which is the main doctrine of the *Vākyapadīya* is nowhere mentioned in the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* is at best an *argumentum ex-silentio* and does not prove anything. The statement that the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* nearly summarises in three verses the theme of the *Meghadūta* is open to correction. The three verses in question merely give us the idea of sending the cloud as messenger and do not embody a summary of the theme of the *Meghadūta*. Yet the argument has a force of its own. The idea of a cloud-messenger is generally believed to have originated with Kālidāsa; but there is nothing to show that it could not have been conceived

by the author of the *Yogavāsiṣṭha*, who is highly imaginative besides being profoundly learned. The argument is, therefore, not decisive, as Atreya says it is. There is, however, a hemistich of a verse not noticed by Atreya, in the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* which is the same as in the *Meghadūta* except for the first word which is *etat* in the *Yogavāsiṣṭha*: *etacchṛṅgam harati pavanaḥ kimsvid ity unmukhībhir dr̥ṣṭotsāhaś cakitacakitam mugdhasiddhāṅganābhiḥ*.⁵ and *adri* in the *Meghadūta*: *adreḥ śṛṅgam harati pavnaḥ kimsvid ity unmukhībhir dr̥ṣṭotsāhaś cakitacakitam mugdhasiddhāṅganābhiḥ*.⁶ This is decisive. It is 'the habit of the author of the *Yogavāsiṣṭha*, to quote P.C. Divanji, 'to borrow the language of previous works such as the Upaniṣad's, *Bhagavadgītā*, *Gauḍapāda Kārikās*, *Vairāgya-śataka*, *Meghadūta* etc., and twist it slightly so as to fit in with his idea'. In keeping with this habit the author of the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* borrows a verse from the *Uttararāmacarita* of Bhavabhūti and twists its language so as to spoil it a little. This verse not noticed by Atreya reads:

*kūjatkun̄jakaṭhoragahvaranadīkvatkāravatkīcaka-
stambhāḍambaramūkamaukulikulah krauñcācalo 'yam giriḥ
etasmin prabalākinām pracalatām udvejitāḥ kūjitair
udvellanti purāṇarohiṇataruskandheṣu kumbhīnasāḥ*⁸ ||

The verse as found in the *Uttararāmacarita* reads:

*guñjatkun̄jakuṣīrakauśikaghaṭāghhūtkāravatkīcaka-
stambhāḍambaramaunamaukulikulah krauñcābhidho 'yam
giriḥ
etasmin pracalākinām pracalatām udvejitāḥ kūjitair
udvellanti purāṇarohiṇataruskandheṣu kumbhīnasāḥ*⁹ ||

A comparison between the verse as it is found in the *Uttararāmacarita* and the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* would reveal that the text of it in the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* is a little defective. Probably it got damaged or corrupted when it reached the *Yogavāsiṣṭha*. The readings in the first line of the stanza as found in the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* are certainly inferior and make little sense. It is a string of words quite unrelated in sense. What are we to understand by *kvatkāra*? Evidently it stands for *ghūtkāra*, the hooting of the owls responsible for terrifying the whole flock of crows into silence.

What does *kaṭhōra* qualify? Where is hooting taking place? Certainly not in the mountain caves and the streams, etc. but in clusters of the bamboos which are said to be full of noise. *Stambha* and *prabalākinām* are perhaps scribal errors; but *krauñcācalaḥ* by the side of *giriḥ* is inexcusable. It is the writer's overfondness for a jingle at the sacrifice of sense. There must, therefore, have been a big time-lag between the *Uttararāmacarita* and the *Yogavāsiṣṭha*. That the *Uttararāmacarita* of the two is earlier from which the verse has been taken in the *Yogavāsiṣṭha*, becomes pretty clear. The *Yogavāsiṣṭha*, therefore, cannot be placed, as Atreya has done, before Bhavabhūti, who flourished in the 7th century A.D. Again, the idea of the line which is the fourth *pāda* of verse 19 in the 115th canto of the latter half of the *Nirvāṇa Prakaraṇa* is found in verse 7 of the Mandasorē Stone Pillar Inscription of Yaśodharman (c. 525-535). We may well say that the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* is of a date later than 535 A.D.

From the literary study of the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* it becomes clear that considerable literary activity had preceded it and the author, a man of prodigious learning, could not resist the temptation of incorporating into his work a line or two from earlier works which appealed to him most and which came readily to his mind to suit the context. He was not a plagiarist. His writings are characterised by originality and profundity of thought. As a poet he can stand comparison with the very best. He was a master of diction and a poet of exceptional ability but on account of these very factors efforts should not be made to place him as early as the fifth century A.D. Even later poets could be original and charming.

Uptil now too much of emphasis has been laid on philosophical and historical evidence to settle the date of the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* and literary and linguistic evidences have been completely ignored. These can be decisive sometimes for they are unimpeachable. For one thing, we find that the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* poetry is characterised by excessive alliteration as also rhyme, a few examples of the latter being:

kanānumuktājālatāpatālam tīresu simhe sulatāsaṭālam!

*taraṅganirdhūtaśilograkacchaṁ mahītalākāśam
anantakaccham ॥*¹⁰

*senayor ubhayor āsīd yuddham udyatadānavam ।
niṣpiṣṭanagaragrāmagirikānanamānavam ॥*¹¹

*ātmaikarāmaḥ paripūrṇakāmo bhavābhayo rāma
śamābhirāmaḥ ।*¹²

*sarva eva jagādbhāvā avicāreṇa cāravaḥ ।
avidyamānasadbhāvā vicāraviśārāravaḥ ॥*¹³

Now, the use of rhyme in Sanskrit is a later development. Sten Konow is very right when he says, "Rhyme forms as essential element of versification in the poetry of the modern vernaculars and also of Prakrit but not in Sanskrit. Where rhyme occurs in Sanskrit poetry as, for instance, in that of Jayadeva, we may assume that the influence of the vernacular or of Prakrit poetry has been at work"¹⁴. It is of interest to note that Sten Konow makes these observations in connection with a work of Rājaśekhara who belongs to the 10th century A.D. Now, what are the special characteristics of the work of Rājaśekhara are the special characteristics of the *Yogavāsiṣṭha*. The obvious conclusion, therefore, from this is that the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* belongs to a period when rhyme under the influence of Prakrit poetry had come to be accepted in Sanskrit. That period was evidently fairly late, about the second quarter of the 10th Century A.D. The 10th century, therefore, assigned to the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* by P.C. Divanji, seems nearer the truth.¹⁵ He has arrived at this date from other sources. He has not taken help of the literary evidence which would also have been very helpful. The unusual profusion of the onomatopoeic words, some 100 of which have been traced in the *Yogavāsiṣṭha*¹⁶ (some of these 100 have been used as many as 30 times), a number of Prakritisms, the highly ornate poetry, specially in the second half of the *Nirvāṇa Prakaraṇa*, too much of alliteration—¹⁷ all lead to this one conclusion that the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* is a production of a fairly late period. It cannot be of the "second quarter of the 10th century A.D." as P.C. Divanji has said, although there is nothing inherently against it but

because of the irreconcilability of this date with the fact of the existence of an abridgement of the *Yogavāsiṣṭha*, the *Yogavāsiṣṭhasāra*, by one Gauḍa Abhinanda in the 9th century A.D. P.C. Divanji, himself finds his date coming into conflict with this important piece of evidence for he himself says:

It is also clear from what has preceded that he must have done that either during the first half of the 10th century A.D. or at any rate after that and that none of the arguments advanced by Dr. Atreya for the work in its present form having been composed earlier than that is likely to present any insurmountable difficulty except that based on the existence of the abridgement of Abhinanda (italics ours). As the evidence of its composition during or after the second half of the 10th century is so strong, the said arguments cannot be given a preponderating weight and some other explanation must be sought.

This explanation he does not furnish. He concedes that he is not able to do so at present. But then how is the problem to be solved? All other mass of evidence would be of no avail for this single evidence would offset all that. It is difficult to agree with the learned scholar that it (the abridgement of Abhinanda in the 9th century A.D.) does not present any insurmountable difficulty in the way of the second half of the 10th century A.D. being accepted as the date of the *Yogavāsiṣṭha*. In the absence of the satisfactory explanation of this important point it will be difficult to accept the date suggested by P.C. Divanji. We cannot set the *turminus ad quem* at the second half of the 10th Century A.D. We shall have to set it at the 9th century A.D. The work in its present form must have been in wide circulation before that date to have needed an abridgement.

When we discuss the question of the date of the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* it will not be out of point to mention here that there is a vast scope in a work like that for additions. With the passage of time the work must have grown and assumed the size that it now has. Apart from the six sheaths which are a later addition, according

to P.C.Divanji,¹⁸ while the real *Yogavāsiṣṭha*, "is not the whole work, going today by that name, but only a portion of it extending from the 3rd Sarga of the Mumukṣu Prakaraṇa to the 213th Sarga of the latter half of the Nirvāṇa Prakaraṇa", there seems to have been a good deal of interpolation in the text. The exact extent of it cannot be gauged at present for there is no critical edition of the work. Still there are some obvious things which cannot escape our notice. The use of the word *jana* in apposition with *sajjana* as in the expression *sajjanam janam* in the sense of a good person where *janam* is tautological is a recent one. The verses¹⁹ in which we come across such expressions must be later interpolations. The same may be the case with highly ornate poetry found in Cantos 115-119 in the second half of the Nirvāṇa Prakaraṇa. The use of the classical metres like Śārdūlavikrīḍita, the Vasantatilakā, the Mālinī, the Drutavilambita and others, long compounds like

*hemākhilagrāmānyapurasthalīgiritarusthāṇvagrahāroccayāḥ*²⁰,

*vikaṭakāñcanakūṭakoṭisaṅghaṭṭanasphuṭitajarjaracārusandhiḥ*²¹,

etc. the detailed poetic description of the hill-side villages and the various *Anyoktis* which have a beauty and charm all their own point to these cantos having been composed by a later poet. Or else it will be difficult to find a satisfactory evidence for this unusual outburst of poetry in these cantos which have given us some of the finest gems of Sanskrit verses. When we say that this poetry is by a later hand we do not mean that the author of the original *Yogavāsiṣṭha* was incapable of writing such poetry. He was one of the greatest poets. But the style here is at variance with the other parts of the work and there is such a violent break that the above conclusion would certainly be irresistible.

It is not easy to determine the date of such a work as the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* which like the *Rāmāyaṇa* and *Mahābhārata* has continuously been strengthened by extraneous matter which is so skilfully woven into the original that it is difficult to extricate it even with the help of the best scientific aids of research. The original *Yogavāsiṣṭha* must have been a much smaller text. The *Yogavāsiṣṭha* is said to have been composed by the sage Vālmiki.

He himself appears in the dialogue between Vālmiki and Ariṣṭanemi and the dialogue between Vālmiki and Bharadvāja. It is possible, says P. C. Divanji that the same Vālmiki, who is the author of the *Rāmāyaṇa* "might have put his ideas about the true nature and essence of the worldly phenomena and the attitude which the thoughtful amongst men should adopt towards them if they have the desire to remain unaffected by the delusion which the phenomena naturally cause,"²² in a very brief form. We may agree with P. C. Divanji in that the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* was originally a comparatively small, compact work by a single author. But that he was Vālmiki, the author of the immortal *Rāmāyaṇa*, we cannot accept. Why should the great Bard stop short at a small treatise, when moved to sorrow at the killing of a *krauñca* bird by a fowler, he could give us a long poem of six or seven kāṇḍas of the rarest charm? Certainly the original writer must have been a much humbler person than Vālmiki, though this humbler later writer (who chose not to disclose his identity) created a work about the beauty of which he himself was so conscious:

śāstram subodham evedam sālaṅkāravibhūṣitam |
*kāvyaṁ rasamayaṁ cāru dṛṣṭāntaiḥ pratipāditam ||*²³

"This is an easily comprehensible text, a charming poem with Rasa, adorned by figures of speech and explained with examples." This verse probably furnishes the clue as to the redaction of the older text. A later writer probably found the skinny older text to be a little too dry and uninteresting and set about himself to put it in a new garb, charming and beautiful. He added illustrations to explain some of the points put forward in the original so that they may be easily comprehensible to the common man. To highly abstruse philosophy he gave a poetic garb and in the process so changed it as to make it look really different from its base, the small text of an ancient sage. A mighty super-structure was raised on the old foundations. Now, the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* did not remain a philosophical treatise, it became a *rasamaya kāvya*. The redactor whoever he may have been, chose to withhold his identity like many others before him for he was not writing

something new but was only putting the old thing in a new garb. How could he, therefore, give himself out as its author, although in the process of redaction he almost changed it in form, and not, of course, in content, His originality could never be questioned but such was the spirit of self-abnegation in ancient times that writers were only too silent about themselves. They effaced themselves and ascribed their works to age-old sages and saints, sages hallowed in public memory. Or perhaps there was this underlying motive that their works thus ascribed would be read more widely and preserved longer. This gave them some sort of inner satisfaction; but they did deny themselves popularity which could be theirs purely on merits. The language of the *Rāmāyaṇa* and the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* is so different that we cannot persuade ourselves to believe that the two works are of one and the same author. This is why some people think that the *Yogavāsiṣṭha*, if it was from the pen of Vālmīki, must have been in the form of a nucleus which served as the basis for a later writer for building upon it a work of magic drapery.

As has been said above, P. C. Divanji fixed the second quarter of the 10th Century A.D. as the date of the work, when it came to have its present form and content. This conclusion he arrives at, apart from other evidences, on historical evidence, viz., the occurrence of the name of Yaśaskaradeva in the *Yogavāsiṣṭha*, who had his palace in the town of Adhiṣṭhāna. On a reference to Kalhaṇa's *Chronicles of Kashmir* we find that this was the name of a Brāhmaṇa, who was made a king by a class of Brāhmaṇas which was then in power after the overthrow of Suravarman II by one Kamalavardhana in 939. This Yaśaskaradeva ruled justly till 948 A.D. and on his retirement was succeeded by his son Saṅgrāmadeva except for one day when his uncle's son Varṇata ruled there at his desire. As for the city Adhiṣṭhāna, it is mentioned in the *Rājatarāṅgiṇī* IV. 696. From the Introduction²⁴ to Stein's work it is found that one Pravarasena II who ruled in the second half of the sixth century founded a city Pravarapura which was also known as the Navādhiṣṭhāna or the Nūtanādhiṣṭhāna in Heijutsang's time in 631 A.D. to distinguish

it from the Purāṇādhiṣṭhāna or the old city. It appears in course of time the short form of this, i.e. Adhiṣṭhāna, came in use and was referred to in the *Yogavāsiṣṭha*. The description of this city as found in the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* resembles the description of it found in the *Rājatarāṅgiṇī*. It is stated in the *Yogavāsiṣṭha*²⁵ that the city looked beautiful on account of the hills surrounding it. There was a peak of a mountain in the midst of it, which was named Pradyumnaśikhara on the top of which stood a king of houses²⁶. In the *Rājatarāṅgiṇī* there is a mention of a hill named Pradyumna whose modern name is Pampar. There is a further mention of the building of two temples and a Maṭha for the Pāśupata mendicants by King Raṇāditya of Kashmir and his wife. From this it may be inferred that there may have been structures in Adhiṣṭhāna or Nūtanādhiṣṭhāna, the alternate name of Pravarapura. From the identification of Yaśaskaradeva of the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* with the Brāhmaṇa king of the same name of *Rājatarāṅgiṇī* and the Adhiṣṭhāna with Pravarapura, P. C. Divanji has built up a case for the author of the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* to have flourished in any case after 949 A.D. or in the second half of the 10th Century A.D., as he could put it. He has taken great pains to secure the identification which is complete. But how will this date agree with the fact of Gauḍa Abhinanda's abridgement of the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* in the 9th Century A.D.? An abridgement presupposes the existence of the original. The only conclusion to be drawn from this is that the portions of the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* on which P. C. Divanji builds up his theory of the second half of the 10th century A.D. do not form part of the original text. They are subsequent additions. It appears rather odd that P. C. Divanji himself says, "The second reason why I consider that these are subsequent additions in the work is that there is a distinct and unmistakable reference to a king of Kashmir of the name of Yaśaskaradeva²⁷ and yet he tries to fix the date of the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* on the basis of these very "subsequent additions." The whole setting there has a modern look about it. The use of the verb in the future tense was usually the *modus operandi* of the interpolaters as would be seen from the *Bhaviṣya-purāṇa* and

other Purāṇas. The explanation that Vasiṣṭha, the great sage, might have had a prophetic vision of the incidents to take place is feeble and is hardly likely to carry conviction in an age of scientific thought. P. C. Divanji cannot persuade himself to believe that the unnamed author of the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* was living in an age prior to that of Yaśaskaradeva. The familiarity that the author shows in describing the places and persons residing in Kashmir makes Divanji believe that he (the author) must be writing this account when Yaśaskara was ruling Kashmir and Nṛsiṃha was his minister or when one of the successors of Yaśaskara was on the throne. Now, we are in perfect agreement with Divanji so far this portion of the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* is concerned. Any one who composed it must have been a contemporary of Yaśaskaradeva or must have followed him not long after. But this we cannot say of the whole of the *Yogavāsiṣṭha*. Even after the old nucleus of Vālmiki had been put in a new garb and the new *Yogavāsiṣṭha* had emerged, there was ample scope for interpolations in it. In a huge work like this there is enough scope for further additions and accretion of much foreign matter. Our contention is that *Yogavāsiṣṭha* minus later additions which may never be discovered or if discovered, will be discovered with stupendous labour, must have reached its present shape earlier than the 9th Century A.D. when Gauḍa Abhinanda thinking the volume of the work to be rather unwieldy set about to prepare an abridgement of it so that it may be more handy for the common man for whose upliftment it is meant.

Ninth Century A.D. is, therefore, the *terminus ad quem*. What is then the *terminus a quem*? Shiva Prasad Bhattacharya fixed it in the 12th Century A.D.²⁸ His principal arguments for this are:

- (i) The *Yogavāsiṣṭha* has a Buddhistic setting. There are certain episodes or *Ākhyānas* which deal with cycles of births much like the Jātakas.
- (ii) The author shows favouritism for certain words like Malita, Buddha, Bhāva, Śūnya, Cit, Ātman, Karman, Nirvāṇa, etc. The rather unorthodox connotation attached to them shows his leaning towards Buddhistic tenets.

- (iii) The *Yogavāsiṣṭha* mentions the Pārasīkas and Tāmrayavanas²⁹ in a brief account of battle between the kings of Western India. The Pārasīkas were the people of Afghanistan who began to attack India after the 10th Century A.D. in hordes for plunder and ravage and ultimately acquired mastery. In the story as given in the *Yogavāsiṣṭha*, it is not said as to whether the Indian princes were overthrown or any part of India was conquered by these.
- (iv) The reference to the Vedānta philosophers as the Vedāntins or the Vedāntavādins³⁰ would point out the time of the work to be after Śaṅkara.
- (v) In the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* the Purāṇas are called *Bahupāṭhas*³¹ or having many readings or recensions. Moreover, from another text,³² it appears that the author of the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* was familiar with the *Bhāgavata-purāṇa*. Its acceptance of the hard and the fast division between Amśakalā and Bhagavattva of Viṣṇu is just on the line of the *Bhāgavata-purāṇa* which according to Pargiter³³ was a work of the 10th Century A.D.
- (vi) The commentator of the work Ānanda Bodha Sarasvatī, as he himself says, was the earliest to comment on the *Yogavāsiṣṭha*.³⁴ He belongs to the 17th Century A.D.

All these facts mentioned above lead, according to Bhattacharya, to the conclusion that the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* must have been written between the 10th and the 12th Centuries A.D.

The arguments put forward by Shiva Prasad Bhattacharya have all been very well examined by B.L. Atreya and P.C. Divanji who believe the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* to have come to assume its present shape after the 5th Century A.D. and the second half of the 10th Century A.D. respectively.

As for the mention of the Yavanas or the Pārasīkas we know that they had begun making inroads into India much earlier than the 10th Century A.D. Moreover, the Pārasīkas were the Persians and they are mentioned in the *Mahābhārata*. Their mention in the *Yogavāsiṣṭha*, therefore, should not be taken as a proof for the late date of the work.

Even if the work be conceded to be post-Śaṅkaran on account of the mention of the followers of the Vedānta school by the term Vedāntins or Vedāntavādins, we are nowhere nearer the period of the 10th-12th Century A.D. when the work might have been composed. This evidence only leads to the conclusion that the work is of a period later than 820 A.D. when Śaṅkarācārya is said to have died. But there is reason to infer that the work is pre-Śaṅkaran. At any rate the Vedānta philosophy did not originate with Śaṅkara. Śaṅkara only made the mass of Vedāntic theories afloat much before his time into a system. The occurrence of the term *vivarta* in the *Vākyapadīya* of Bhartṛhari which the latest modern researches have proved to be a work of the 3rd Century A.D., if not earlier³⁵ and the *Uttararāmacarita* of Bhavabhūti, a work of the 7th Century A.D.³⁶ and the presence of the seeds of the Vedāntic thought even in as early a period as that of the Vedas³⁷ and the Upaniṣads would lead inevitably to the conclusion that the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* had enough to draw upon so far as its Vedānta philosophy was concerned. "The *Yogavāsiṣṭha*, because of its palpable inconsistencies and its sweet vagueness in technology"³⁸ precludes the possibility that its author had before him a highly systematic and philosophical work of Śaṅkara. "That no writer and scholiast on Philosophy earlier than Vijñānabhikṣu had used it as an authority" to refute or defend a position³⁹ would only strengthen the above contention that it was a work of the *Rāmāyaṇa* and the *Mahābhārata* style which are compendia of all the information and, therefore, efforts should not be made to make it subsequent to any particular writer, much less Śaṅkara. "The philosophical groundwork of the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* is a complex fabric of theories and doctrines, not very closely and systematically joined"⁴⁰.

The other contention of Shiva Prasad Bhattacharya that the author of the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* shows the influence of the *Bhāgavata-purāṇa*, a work according to Pargiter of the 10th Century A.D., can be effectively countered as P. C. Divanji has done, by pointing out that the latest researches have fixed the date of the *Bhāgavata-purāṇa* much earlier. As B. N. Krishnamurti Sarma has said, "The

Bhāgavata-purāṇa was well-known in the 10th Century, extant in the Seventh, not unknown in the sixth and had very likely been composed in the 5th Century A.D., if not earlier still."⁴¹ If the *Bhāgavata-purāṇa* had been composed in the 5th Century A.D. or even earlier than that, the author's (of the *Yogavāsishtha*) whose date we have fixed before the 9th Century A.D. familiarity with *Bhāgavata-purāṇa* would be very natural and would not lead to any such conclusion as the one Bhattacharya has arrived at. If the *Bhāgavata-purāṇa* belongs to at least 5th century A.D. if not earlier and the date of the most of the older *Purāṇas* is earlier or later than this date, it would not be surprising if by the time of the *Yogavāsishtha*, i.e. before the 9th Century A.D., they come to have many readings or recensions. The argument of the *Purāṇas* being called *Bahupāthas* in the *Yogavāsishtha* is not conclusive and should not be stressed a little too much.

That the earliest commentator on the work belongs to the 17th Century A.D. is no proof positive for the late production of the work. There have been instances where works produced quite early did not have commentators until a very late date. Even in the case of the *R̥gveda* the earliest work of the mankind, the earliest well-known commentary so far available is that of Sāyaṇa who belongs to the 14th Century A.D. Helārāja, the earliest commentator⁴² on the *Vākyapadīya* of Bhartṛhari, a work, as has been stated above, of the 3rd Century A.D. or of a period earlier than that belongs to the first half of the 10th Century A.D.⁴³

The late appearance of the commentators may be an indication in the case of the *Yogavāsishtha*, of the comparative neglect that it suffered as would be evident from the fact that "no scholiast and writer on philosophy earlier than Vijñānabhikṣu seems to use it."⁴⁴ This neglect may be due to the *Yogavāsishtha*'s "palpable inconsistencies and its sweet vagueness in technology"⁴⁵.

As for the Buddhist influence Shiva Prasad Bhattacharya himself concedes that ... "This does not help us much beyond proving that there was an admixture of Buddhistic doctrines; as to time it does not take us much beyond the sixth Century A.D.,

even if the author be regarded as a rather late follower of the Yogācārin teacher Asaṅga⁴⁶.

Now, that all the arguments of Bhattacharya have been effectively dealt with, we cannot fix the *terminus a quem* at the 12th Century A.D. Nor can we agree with P.C. Divanji to fix it at "the fourth quarter of the 10th Century"⁴⁷. It must be fixed, as we have stated above, at the 9th Century, A.D. when an abbreviation of it by the name of the *Yogavāsiṣṭhasāra* by Gauḍa Abhinanda appeared while we are prepared to concede that additions and interpolations were carried on in the work even down to a very late period. Even allowing a period of one hundred or at the most two hundred years from the redaction of the nucleus to the appearance of its abridgement, we may say that the work might have been a product of the 8th or at the most of the 7th Century A.D. This date does not come into conflict with the fact of the "Kāvya style paraphernalia with which the work is permeated" which together with rhetorical effects and conceits" would go to show that it is a specimen of the later exuberant but extravagant Kāvya style." This extravagance or exuberance in Kāvya was as much a characteristic of the period between the 7th to 9th Century A.D. as it was that of the period between the 10th to 12th Century A.D.

V. Raghavan is the last to approach the problem of the date of the *Yogavāsiṣṭha*⁴⁸. He has taken great pains to controvert the theory of B. L. Atreya that the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* is a post-Śāṅkaran work. Even if we agree on the basis of Raghavan's argument and the fact of direct attacks on Śāṅkara's doctrines in the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* and a pointed reference to a verse in *Vivekacūḍāmaṇi* to which P. C. Divanji has drawn attention in his paper,⁴⁹ we do not find ourselves in insuperable difficulty for the last date for Śāṅkara as proposed by some scholars which is 820 A.D. The *Yogavāsiṣṭha* might have come to its present shape round about 850 A.D. Forty to forty five years should be a sufficient period for the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* to have become so popular with the masses as to necessitate an abridgement of it. However, there is a powerful body of opinion among scholars which

believes that there have been many Śaṅkarācāryas and among them the first one, the Ādi Śaṅkarācārya, the author of the *Bhāṣya* on the *Vedānta-sūtras* and the *Vivekacūḍāmaṇi* belongs to the 1st century B.C.⁵⁰ The Śaṅkara evidence which has been pressed a little too much by some scholars does not prove anything conclusively and, therefore, not much importance needs be attached to it.

It is rather interesting that there is a mention quite a few times⁵¹ of inscriptions in the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* in the form of standard of comparison, *Upamāna*. This may well lead to the surmise that the author or the redactor of the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* was very familiar with inscriptions and that he was living in a period when these were quite in abundance in the country. Surely the thing with which a person is more familiar generally comes to his mind when he seeks to compare one thing with the other. This fact would go against the theory of the early date of the *Yogavāsiṣṭha*. It is in the 8th or the 9th Century A.D. that we find that India is dotted with inscriptions on stone slabs and pillars. This must have been very much in the mind of the author of the *Yogavāsiṣṭha*, when he gave it the form in which we find it today, of course even in the 5th Century A.D., the date proposed by B.L. Atreya, we have a number of inscriptions of the Guptas and the Vākāṭakas and before them the inscriptions of the Indo-Greeks and Indo-Bactrians and the Mauryans, yet all of them taken together do not reach the vast figures which we find in the later centuries which seems to have very much struck the author of the *Yogavāsiṣṭha*. However, there is bound to be difference on this point because apart from throwing some vague hints this does not take us anywhere nearer to the definite date of the *Yogavāsiṣṭha*.

The date of the *Yogavāsiṣṭha*, therefore, must remain a problem as the date of any other Sanskrit work the author of which has unfortunately left no biographic details about himself. Arguments and counter-arguments will continue to be given in support of one view or the other, till some conclusive evidence is available⁵². As matters stands at present, we can only put

forward a theory which will be one of the many in the field. The above discussion leads us to these three conclusions:—

- (i) That the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* is a work of the first quarter of the 9th Century A.D. while in the last quarter of it there had appeared an abridgement of it.
- (ii) That there was a nucleus of the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* which must have been very ancient. In the 9th Century A.D. some master genius adopted it as a basis and built upon it a super-structure. It was he, the anonymous writer, who gave to the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* its present form.
- (iii) That the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* continued to be enriched with extraneous matter from time to time and interpolations in it continued to be made inspite of definite form which was given to it in the 9th Century A.D.

REFERENCES

1. See B.L. Atreya, *The Philosophy of the Yogavāsiṣṭha* (Section: The Probable date of the *Yogavāsiṣṭha*), Chapter II, pp. 11-27; P.C. Divanji, The Date and Place of Origin of the *Yogavāsiṣṭha*, *The Calcutta Oriental Journal*, Vol. 1., 1933-34, pp. 153-170; Shiva Prasad Bhattacharya, *Proceedings of the All-India Oriental Conference*, Madras, Vol. III, 1924, pp. 545-554; V. Raghavan, The Date of the *Yogavāsiṣṭha*, *Journal of Oriental Research*, Madras, 1947-48, Vol. XVII.
2. *The Philosophy of the Yogavāsiṣṭha*, Section II; p. 26.
3. Sadhu Ram, Bhartṛhari's Date, *Journal of the Ganganath Jha Research Institute*, Allahabad, Vol. IX, 1952 pp. 135-151.
4. *The Philosophy of the Yogavāsiṣṭha*, Chapter II. But if on the ground of the mention of the cloud-messenger the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* is held to have borrowed from Kālidāsa, it must also be later than Bhavabhūti for it has a number of verses common to Bhavabhūti's works. Indeed it is inconceivable that the great poet Bhavabhūti could have borrowed these verses from the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* and passed them on as his own.
5. VI (i). 115-19.
6. I. 14.

7. The Date and Place of Origin of the *Yogavāsiṣṭha*, *The Calcutta Oriental Journal*, 1933-34; p 160.
8. VI (ii) 115.11.
9. *Uttararāmacarita*, II.29.
10. VI (ii). 117.5.
11. IV. 26.26.
12. VI (ii). 28.33.
13. II. 13.26.
Here, only a few examples are given. For an exhaustive treatment of the subject, see Section III in Chapter 'Yogavāsiṣṭha — A Literary Study', of the author's forthcoming book, *Studies in the Language and the Poetry of the Yogavāsiṣṭha*."
14. *Karpūramaijari*, Introduction, p. 505, Motilal Banarsidas, Delhi, 1963.
15. The Date and Place of Origin of the *Yogavāsiṣṭha*, *The Calcutta Oriental Journal*, 1933-34, p. 166.
16. See the author's article: Onomatopoeia in the *Yogavāsiṣṭha*, Transactions of the Linguistic Circle of Delhi, 1968, pp. 13-28.
17. The Date and Place of Origin of *Yogavāsiṣṭha*, *The Calcutta Oriental Journal*, 1933-34, p. 166.
18. *ibid.*, p. 156-57.
19. VI (ii). 1.8.25.
20. VI (ii). 115.7.
21. VI (ii) 115.41.
22. P. C. Divanji; The Date and Place of Origin of the *Yogavāsiṣṭha*, *The Calcutta Oriental Journal*, 1933-35, p. 158.
23. II. 18.33.
24. Chapter V, para 82, pp. 84-85.
25. IV. 32.11-15.
26. IV. 32.16; VI. 32.11.13.
So, when we talk of the author of the work we mean by it the writer who gave the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* its present shape. For us that anonymous poet is the author.
27. The Date and Place of Origin of the *Yogavāsiṣṭha*, *The Calcutta Oriental Journal*, 1933-34, p. 160.
28. The *Yogavāsiṣṭha Rāmāyaṇa*: Its probable date and place of inception, *Proceedings of All India Oriental Conference*, Madras, Volume III. 1924. pp. 545-554.
29. III. 37.20-24, Cf. also.

- CC-0. Mumukshu Bhawan Varanasi Collection. New Delhi. Digitized by S3 Foundation USA

49. The Date and Place of Origin of the *Yogavāsiṣṭha*, *The Calcutta Oriental Journal*. 1933-34, p. 167.
50. V.B. Athwale, The Date of Ādya Śaṅkarācārya (The First Century A.D.), *The Poona Orientalist*, Vol. XIX, January, October, 1954, S. Srikantaya, Date of Śaṅkarācārya, *Journal of the Mythic Society of India*, Vol. XXXXVI, 1955-56.
51. III. 61.8; III. 62.16; IV. 2.20; VI (1) 46.33. VI (i) 46.36.
52. We are unable to agree with Prof. Stecherbasky "that Prof. Atreya has brought the problem (of the Date of the *Yogavāsiṣṭha*) very nearer to its final solution" ... *Vāsiṣṭha Darśanam*, chapter, II. p. 19.

The Plan of the *Yogavāsiṣṭha*

The *Yogavāsiṣṭha* is divided into six chapters which are titled as Vairāgya, Mumukṣu, Utpatti, Sthiti, Upaśama and Nirvāṇa. The Nirvāṇa-prakaraṇa is the biggest of all and is divided into first half (Pūrvārdha) and latter half (Uttarārdha). According to a statement in the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* itself the work contains 32000 verses,¹ but the vulgate edition of it as brought out by the Nirṇaya Sāgara Press does not contain more than 29289 verses, which are divided into various chapters in the following manner: The Vairāgya has 1146, Mumukṣu 807, Utpatti 6304, Sthiti 2414, Upaśama 4322, and Nirvāṇa 14296 verses (in the first part of this chapter there are 5331 verses, and in the latter part 8965).

In the beginning of the work the author gives his reason for composing it. It is that the sage Vālmiki composed a few Rāma-stories and taught them to his pupil Bharadvāja who, recited them to Brahmā on the mount Meru. Brahmā was highly pleased with him and asked him to choose a boon. Bharadvāja asked him to show the path by which people could be freed from misery. Brahmā told him to go to Vālmiki and request him to finish the *Rāmāyaṇa*, which he had begun to write in the form of a dialogue between Rāma and Vasiṣṭha, but had not completed. By reading this people would attain true knowledge which would lead them to final absolution. Not only does Brahmā ask Bharadvāja to go to Vālmiki with this request, he himself goes to his Āśrama and requests him to complete the *Yogavāsiṣṭha Rāmāyaṇa* which had been left unfinished by him. This he should do, suggests Brahmā,

so that people may be freed from misery. Vālmīki agrees and completes the work.

The introduction to the *Yogavāsishtha* is rather interesting and in the matter of style resembles the *Bhāgavata*. The story is introduced like this: A Brāhmaṇa named Sutikṣṇa goes to the sage Agastī and asks him which of the two paths, the path of action and the path of knowledge, would be better for one who seeks final emancipation. Agastī replies that neither of them would be better. Both would be needed just as both wings are needed for a bird for flying. Then to illustrate his point he introduces a dialogue between Agniveśya and Kārunya. While doing so he introduces a subsidiary dialogue between Suruci, an Apsaras, and Devadūta who tells her that he went to the sage Vālmīki with a request from his Lord Indra to explain to King Ariṣṭanemi, who was practising severe penance, the true nature of things so that he may not refuse to come to heaven. Vālmīki agreed to this request of Indra and the Devadūta took King Ariṣṭanemi to him. When the king asked him to explain the true nature of things, Vālmīki recited to him the *Rāmāyaṇa* which he had composed in the form of a dialogue between Rāma and the sage Vasiṣṭha. Vālmīki's claim was that one who would listen to this *Rāmāyaṇa* would become *jīvanmukta*. King Ariṣṭanemi listened to this *Rāmāyaṇa*. In the course of the recitation of *Yogavāsishtha Rāmāyaṇa* Vālmīki introduces a number of *upākhyānas* to illustrate certain philosophical principles and to make the work interesting and easily intelligible to the masses. In fact, the zeal of the author to create interest in his work is so intense that he gives his dull and drab mass of philosophy a highly poetic garb, which has a permanent appeal and charm for connoisseurs of literature. Then his work is not restricted to the *Śānta-rasa* which must predominate in a work propounding highly philosophical doctrines leading to *vairāgya*, the spirit of renunciation; but also turns into a work by which one attains final emancipation. It introduces a number of *Rasas* to attract the people with different and varied interests. The descriptions of natural phenomena, battles and wars, floods and conflagrations are all there to keep

the reader engrossed. It is these which are introduced intermittently, not to allow the interest of the reader to flag at any time.

The first two *sargas* of the *Vairāgya-prakarāṇa* form an introduction to the *Yogavāsiṣṭha*. The actual dialogue between Rāma and Vasiṣṭha which begins from the third canto of the second chapter called *Mumukṣu* is prefaced by a description of the state of despondency of Rāma when Viśvāmitra comes to take him to the forest, his advice to him to behave like King Janaka who would perform his duty without any feeling of attachment or sorrow and his request to Vasiṣṭha to tell him how he should behave, which he (Vasiṣṭha) complies with readily. This is the subject-matter of the work from the 3rd canto of the *Vairāgya-prakarāṇa* to the 2nd canto of the *Mumukṣu-prakarāṇa*. From the 3rd canto of the *Mumukṣuprakarāṇa* to the 213th Canto of the Second half (*Uttarārdha*) of the *Nirvāṇa-prakarāṇa* is the real *Yogavāsiṣṭha*, the dialogue between Rāma and Vasiṣṭha. From the 214th canto the story is given a finishing touch. In it King Daśaratha, Rāma, Lakṣmaṇa, Nārada, and Śatrughna, express their gratitude to Vasiṣṭha for the *upadeśa* and there is a description in detail as to how King Daśaratha honoured the Brāhmaṇas, fed them and worshipped them. In the 215th canto, Vālmiki winds up his dialogue with Bharadvāja. 216th is the last canto of the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* and serves as the finale to the incidents with which the work is introduced. In the first two verses of this canto the dialogue between Vālmiki and Ariṣṭanemi comes to an end, the latter telling the former in verses 3-8 that his ignorance is now removed and he, therefore, is ready to go to Indra's abode. In verses 9 and 10, the Apsaras expresses her satisfaction and allows the Devadūta to go. In verses 11-12 Agniveśya winds up his talk with his son Kāruṇya, the latter informing him on a query from the former that he would henceforth behave in an unconcerned manner, neither insisting upon the performance of the rites nor avoiding them. And then comes the end. The dialogue between Agasti and Sutiṣṭha is wound up. Agasti tells Sutiṣṭha that he should not entertain a doubt about *jñānakarmaṇ* and think that actions do not lead to bondage after true knowledge has been

attained. From verses 18-24, *Sutīkṣṇa* expresses his gratitude to his teacher for it is on account of his grace only that he has come to know what he should.² The last two verses are in praise of *Brahmā* and *Vasiṣṭha* respectively. The work closes with the lines:

*ekam nityam vimalam acalam sarvadhīśakṣibhūtam
bhāvālitam triguṇarahitam śrīvasiṣṭham natāḥ smaḥ॥*

The Six Sheaths

P.C. Divanji has in his inimitable way explained the six sheaths of the *Yogavāsiṣṭha*: "The *Ātmā* of the teaching of *Vasiṣṭha* (from the 3rd sarga of the *Mumukṣu-prakaraṇa* to the 213th sarga of the second half of the *Nirvāṇa-prakaraṇa* which is the real *Yogavāsiṣṭha*) to *Rāma* is placed in the first sheath of a dialogue between *Bharadvāja* as well as *Brahmā* and *Vālmiki*, that again in the 2nd sheath of a dialogue between *Vālmiki* and *Ariṣṭanemi*, that again in a 3rd sheath of a conversation between *Vālmiki* and *Ariṣṭanemi*, that again in a 4th sheath of a conversation between the *Devadūta* and *Suruci*, the *Apsaras*, that again in a 5th sheath of a teaching imparted by a *Brāhmaṇa* named *Agniśeṣya* to his son *Kāruṇya*, that again in a 6th sheath of a dialogue between the sage *Agastī* and his pupil *Sutīkṣṇa*, and that again in a 7th sheath which is a very thin covering as it consists only of four verses by the unknown author, by the first three of which he makes obeisance to the Highest Essence and by the fourth of which he introduces the dialogue between *Sutīkṣṇa* and *Agastī*. Thus, there are seven layers in the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* as it exists today³."

REFERENCES

1. *mokṣopāyābhidhāneyam saṁhitā sārasmṛitā
trīṁśad dve ca sahasrāṇi jñātā nirvāṇadāyini* ॥ II.17.6.
2. *bhagavaṅs tvatprasādena jñātajñeyo 'smi saṁsthitah*, VI (ii). 216.21.
3. The Date and Place of Origin of the *Yogavāsiṣṭha*, *The Calcutta Oriental Journal*, 1933-34, pp. 157-158.1

Descriptive Poetry in the *Yogavāsiṣṭha*

The *Yogavāsiṣṭha* being a Kāvya, it has beautiful descriptions in it of seasons, mountains, forests, cities and towns. It has enough of descriptive poetry in it which is characterized by deep observation and intimate touch. The descriptions in the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* can compare with some of the very best in Sanskrit literature.

Of these mention may first be made of the description of the journey into space of two girl friends. The description is most vivid. Hand in hand they begin going up and up till they find themselves in space:

*dūrād dūram abhiplutya śanair uccaiḥ padam gate |
hastam haste samālambya yāntyau dadṛśatur nabhaḥ ||*¹

And what they see then is described next. There is space like the Ekāṇava in flood, deep and pure. It is thrilling, limpid and perspicuous:

*āhlādakamalam saumyam śūnyatāmbhonimajjanāt |
atyantaśuddham gambhīram prasannam api sajjanāt ||*²

And then the journey through space is described. How the two ladies come in and go out of the various luminaries is then mentioned. There is a little bit of mythology too. As for example, when it is said that the groups of Dākinīs dance there or that there are heaps of flesh of crows, owls and vultures or that the celestial damsels lose their ornaments as they are called to their respective heavens or that the clouds get pounded up on account of the pacing up and down of Siddhas. But apart from these flashes of

mythology the descriptions have a naturalness about them and appear quite life-like. The imaginative faculty of the poet seems to be at its best in them.

At another place too the poet in the author takes the upper hand. He goes all out in simple and elegant description of a mountain which could well be the envy of any poet. Quite peculiar to the style of the present work, the description is so full of details and has such a wealth of imagery in it that it is a treat in itself. The description extends to no less than thirty seven verses in *Anuṣṭubh* followed by nine verses in *Vasantatilakā* describing the beauty of the mountain-dwellings. All these forty six verses can be cited as the best specimen of ornate classical poetry. Embellished with various figures of speech they stand out as a class in themselves. Alliteration, though a general characteristic of the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* poetry, reaches perfection in them as may be seen from the following examples:

kokakokilakākolakolāhalasamākulam ||³

and

kolāhalākulakulāyakuḷākulānām
kulyākulākakalālāsṛutasāṅkathānām ||⁴

Further

vicitramañjarīpuñjapīñjarāmbudamaṇḍalam ||⁵

Also in the work is found the description of a hermitage which more or less takes after the traditional pattern. In the story as told in the second half of the *Nirvāṇa Prakaraṇa* one Kundadanta narrates the experiences of his long journeys in various countries and places. In the course of the narration he says that after he had stayed at the Gaurī Temple for six months he had come to have the same old experience which he had before. He had before his eyes once again the same old hermitage of the sage (Muni). At this follows the description of the hermitage in two verses which are particularly charming and appealing.

puṣpakhaṇḍatarucchāyāsuptamugdhamrgārbhakam
parṇoṭajājāgraviśrāntaśukodgrāhitaśāstradr̥k ||

*tad brahmalokasaṅkāśam ehi munyāśramam śriye |
gacchāvo'cchataram tatra cetah punyair bhaviṣyati ||*⁶

“Let us go for glory to the sage’s hermitage which very much resembles the abode of Brahmā where the innocent young ones of deer are asleep under the shady trees laden with flowers and where the parrots resting in fore-parts of the hamlets are putting forward the Śāstric views; where the mind on account of the religious merit is likely to become purer.”

The story here takes a different and altogether new turn. What happens is that Kundadanta and his companion after reaching the hermitage find it quite different from what they had visualised it earlier. They find it a desolate, barren piece of land. “No tree was to be seen there, no hamlet, no shrub, no human being. The sage was not there, not even a child, nor was there an altar, nor a Brāhmaṇa. It was nothing but void. (In desolation) the forest appeared endless as if the hot sky had come to rest on the earth.” This description of the desolation is by far the very best in the whole of the *Yogavāsiṣṭha*. The style of the author too accords well with its spirit. It is dynamic, emotional and racy as may be seen from the following verses:

*na vṛkṣam noḥajam kiñcin na gulmam na ca mānavam |
na munim nārbhakam nānyan na vedi na ca vā dvijam ||*

*kevalam śūnyam evāti tad aranyam anantakam |
tāpopataptam abhito bhūmau sthitam ivāmbaram ||*⁷

Another most beautiful description which is matchless in its flow of words and the opportunity that it affords for the most effective play of imagery is again found in the second half of the *Nirvāṇa Prakaraṇa*. The description is that of the ocean *Ekārṇava* in flood; when the earth is submerged under the raining water and the snowfall. The waters of the *Ekārṇava* gush forth in thousand torrents, carrying with them all that comes their way. There is death and destruction everywhere. The swollen *Ekārṇava* resembles a foolish master: *Ekārṇavaḥ samucchūna āsīn mūrkhā ivesvaraḥ*. From the mountains down to withered grass roll in its big whirlpools. The billows going up in it swallow as it were the

orb of the sun. The mountains Meru, Mahendra, Kailāsa, Vindhya and Sahya become its aquatic beings while elephants turning out to be as insignificant as the lotus stalks disappear in the mud of the sunken earth. The ocean is full of the moss in the form of the half burnt groves of trees. It looks as if it has been created out of the ashes of the three worlds. It is detestible on account of the mud. The Twelve Ādityas give the appearance of lotuses in it going up as they do on the pillars in the form of the sky. The mighty clouds give the feeling of a lotus with its leaves vanished. In the vicinity of its mountains of foam there roar the mad clouds. The multitude of terrible gods and demons are carried away in it much like logs of wood. Slowly rising up it looks like licking the sun. The bubbles are being produced in it on account of the clouds roaring louder and louder; the bubbles being so big as to create the illusion of mountains. It is fully satiated on account of swallowing up of the three worlds. It is singing as it were in the form of its roarings and dancing by throwing up its treelike arms in the form of the waves which are wearing bangles in the form of the terrible mountains (which are being washed away in it). When on account of the flooded Ekārṇava water the partial destruction of the three worlds was being wrought, there was none who could afford protection, none alas who could not be said to be under the grip of the waves. At that fateful moment there was neither the sky nor the end of the quarters. There was neither below nor above. There was no being, no creation. Only there were waters all over. The destruction was complete. There was nothing left which could await destruction. The roaring waters had swept away everything. It was a *Jalapralaya* with all its havoc; with all its destruction. All that moment what could be visible to the eye was water only, water gushing forth on all sides, a vast sheet of water spreading over the earth. The climax had been reached. It was a terrible moment and at this the author was probably reminded of the famous Nāsadiya hymn in the *Rgveda*. He altered it a bit to suit his expression. He found that it could very well serve his purpose in describing the destruction caused by the Ekārṇava in flood!

*nākāśam āsīn na diganta āsīd
 adho 'pi nāsin na tad ūrdhvam āsīt |
 bhūtaṁ na āsīn na ca sarga āsīd
 āsīt param kevalam eva vāri ||*⁸

It is not only in the description of nature and natural phenomena that the author excels; physical features too occupy his equal attention. Thus in the narrative of Cūḍālā and Śikhidhvaja when Cūḍālā, who had earlier assumed the form of a young handsome lad, Kumbha assumes the form of another lady Madanikā and marries Śikhidhvaja her would-be husband (Śikhidhvaja) in this new form does her make up himself and praises her charming beauty in so many words; thus affording us an insight into the author's conception of feminine beauty. We may quote below the following three verses through which Śikhidhvaja describes the charming features of his would-be wife:

*rājase mrgaśāvākṣi lakṣmīr iva navoditā ||*⁹
*padmakośāṅkurahr̥dā lolanīlotpalekṣaṇā |
 āmodaśubhajhāṅkāṛā svāsthītā padminīva sā ||*
*suraktapallavakarā stanastabakadhāriṇī |
 tvam anekaphalā manye kāmakalpataror latā ||*
*himaśītāvadātāṅgī jyotsnāprasarahāsinī |
 pūrṇenduśrīr ivodyuktā hr̥ṣṭaivāhlādayasy alam ||*¹⁰

"O Ye with eyes like those of a fawn, thou appearest like the newly grown Lakṣmī with thy heart like the sprout of the interior of the lotus. Thy eyes resemble the unsteady blue lotuses. Thou lookest like a well-stationed lotus stalk with the charming humming of the bees caused by fragrance. Thy hands are red like tender leaves; thy breasts are like buds. Methinks thou art the creeper of the Tree of Cupid with a rich variety of flowers. Thy body is as white as the cold snow. Thy laughter resemblest the spread of the moonlight. With the rising beauty of the full moon thou givest to me intense joy and happiness."

The treatment of the feminine beauty in the *Yogavāsishtha* will not be complete if mention is not made here of the description of the most charming beauty of a girl whom sage Vasishtha (after

rising from long meditation) spotted as he was looking for the very sweet sound that had first fallen into his ears. The girl was a perfect specimen of feminine beauty enhanced not inconsiderably by the peculiar and mysterious circumstances in which she was introduced. The *Yogavāsiṣṭha* describes the beauty of the girl in the following words:

śabdadeśapataddr̥ṣṭir dr̥ṣṭavān vanitām aham |
pārśve kanakanīṣpandaprabhayā bhāsitāmbaram ||
loladhammillavalanām anyām śriyam ivāgatām |
kāntakāñcanagaurāṅgīm mārgasthanavayauvanām ||
vanadevīm ivāmodisarvāvayavasundarīm |
sā pūrṇacandravadanā puṣpaparakarahāsinī ||
ākāśakośasadanā śāśāṅkakarasundarī |
muktākālāparacanā kāntā madanusārīṇī ||¹¹

This is the description of the physical beauty of the heroine *par excellence*. Here, the hero praises the heroine in words which are matchless. Earlier, however, it is the heroine Madanikā who praises the beauty of the hero, King Śikhidhvaja, who will shortly be her husband. Her appreciation of the handsomeness and the charm of her lord is as instinctive as it is genuine as may be seen from the following examples:

rājase 'titarām rājan mām karoṣi smarāturām |
rater vivāhe madanam abhibhūyādhitīṣṭhasi ||
indor ivāmśujālāni rājan mālyāni tāni te |
merugaṅgāpravāhābhām dhatte hāras tavorasi ||
mandārakusumaprotaiḥ kuntalair nr̥pa rājase |
kanakābham ivollolair bhr̥gigaiḥ khacitakesarāḥ ||
ratnāmśujālaiḥ kusumaiḥ śriyā sthairyeṇa tejasā |
ratnasthānam vibho merum abhibhūyāvatiṣṭhase ||¹²

"You look very charming, O king, you make me passionate, you stand even above Cupid excelling him at the time of the marriage of Rati. Those garlands of yours, O king, are really the multitudes of the rays of the moon. The necklace on your chest carries in it the beauty of the flow of the Gaṅgā from the mount Meru. O king,

thou lookest handsome on account of thy tresses wherein are woven the flowers of the Mandāra tree. O Lord, thou excellest even the mount Meru, the place of origin of the pearls on account of the multitudes of the rays of the jewels, flowers, handsomeness, perseverance and majesty. Thou appearest like a golden lotus with its hovering bees smeared with pollen."

Apart from the physical beauty the description of the various qualities of the king too has its own charm. Just as in the *Raghuvamśa* and other classical poems the qualities of head and heart of the various kings are described in detail so in the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* are they dealt with in detail. Thus, the author says about Śikhidhvaja:

mālavānām pure śrīmañ śikhidhvaja itīśvaraḥ |
dhairyaudāryadaśāyuktaḥ kṣamāśamadamānvitaḥ ||
śūraḥ śubhasamācāro maunī guṇagaṇākaraḥ |
āhartā sarvayajñānām jetā sarvadhanuṣmatām ||
kartā sakalakāryāṇām bhartāpūrvavapur bhuvah |
peśalasnigdhamadhuro vidagdhaḥ prītisāgaraḥ ||
sundaraḥ śāntasubhagaḥ pratāpī dharmavatsalaḥ |
veditā vinayārthānām dātā sakalasampadām ||
bhoktā satsaṅgasahitaḥ sa śrotā sakāśruteḥ |
*vedāsau mānanāśūnyaḥ straiṇam tṛṇavad asprśan ||*¹³

"There was a king named Śikhidhvaja in the capital of Mālava (Ujjayinī) who combined in him the qualities of steadfastness and liberality and had forgiveness, peaceableness and self-control. He was brave, decent in conduct, reticent; a mine of various qualities. He was the performer of all sacrifices, conqueror of all archers, destroyer of all evils, protector of the earth. He was soft, affectionate and sweet and was wise; the very ocean of love. He was beautiful, peaceful and handsome. He was majestic and lover of Dharma. He would speak words which would inculcate in others *vinaya*; he was the giver of all riches. He would rejoice in the company of the good and would listen attentively to all the Śrutis. He knew everything, but was still without pride and would avoid contact with womenfolk."

At another place too we have an equally charming description of the qualities of head and heart of the hero of the story, King Janaka. We have in the work the following verses about him:

asty astamitasarvāpad udyatsampad udāradhīḥ |
videhānām mahīpālo janako nāma vīryavān ||
kalpavṛkṣo 'rthisārthānām mitrābjānām divākaraḥ |
mādhavo bandhupuṣpāṇām strīṇām makaraketanah ||
dvijakairavaśītāmśur dviṣattimirabhāskaraḥ |
saujanya ratnajaladhir bhuvam viṣṇur ivāsthitaḥ ||¹⁴

"There was a brave king named Janaka, the ruler of the Videha country, whose all misfortunes had taken leave of him, who had a liberal heart due to the growing fortune, who was the desire-yielding tree for the groups of supplicants, who was the sun for the lotuses in the form of friends, who was the spring for the flowers in the form of relatives, Cupid for women, the moon for the Kairavas in the form of Brāhmins, the sun for the removal of the darkness in the form of enemies, ocean of jewels in the form of goodness. He occupied the earth like God Viṣṇu."

It is in the story of Cūḍālā and Śikhidhvaja that we meet with a very beautiful and graphic description of the king of seasons, the spring. It is with the approach of the spring that the story gains in meaning and content. As the king had carried on his conquest of the quarters for as long as sixteen years and had fearlessly and in accordance with Dharma ruled over his subjects he experienced, as the years rolled by, the approach of the spring with all its excitements and felt a strange sensation in him, a hitherto unknown craving for the company of a consort who would brighten up his otherwise dull and drab routine. It was this yearning, this craving for a companion that ultimately led him to his marriage with Cūḍālā who added some meaning and purpose to his life. In her company he helped himself to the full from the brimful cup of youthful pleasures. The poet describes in vivid details the beauties and charms of the season which in Indian tradition has come to be known as R̥tūrāja. The following verses which describe this season bear reproduction:

atha gacchatsu varṣeṣu vasante prollasaty alam ॥

*puṣpeṣu jṛmbhamāṇeṣu sphuratsu śaśirasmiṣu ॥
mañjarījāladolāsu viṭapāntaḥpurāntare ॥*

*rajaḥkarpūradhavaḥ valaddalakapāṭake ॥
āmodavilasatpuṣpagulucchakavitānake ॥*

*gāyatsu gahaneṣūccair mithuneṣv alinām mithaḥ ॥
āvāti madhure vāyau śaśiśṭikaraśītale ॥*

kadalīkandalīkacchatalapallavalāsini ॥

kāntām prati babhūvāsyā vasat cetaḥ samutsukam ॥ 15

“As the years passed by and the spring was fully on, the flowers bloomed while the rays of the moon shone forth. The mind of him (the king) which was already set on a beloved became anxious for her. The gentle breeze cooled by the moon and the sprays of waters danced on the tender leaves and the surface of the plantains. The pairs of bees sang loudly among themselves in the forests, in the swing of the intertwined bowers, in the midst of the harems formed from the twigs turned white on account of the camphor in the form of dust and having gates in the form of the turning leaves.”

At another place too, there is a brief description of the spring. It occurs in the context of the wanderings of King Janaka in the forest. As he was roaming about it—the spring season had made a visit to it most enjoyable and thoroughly rewarding—he went very far, left his followers behind and overheard the conversations of the Siddhas from behind the grove of the Tamāla trees. The following verse describes the beauty of the spring which the king noticed while moving about in the forest:

sa kadācin madhau matte kokilālāpalāsini ॥

yayau kusumitābhogaṁ suvilāsilatāṅgaṁ ॥

līlayopavanaṁ kāntām nandanāṁ vāsavo yathā ॥ 16

“Once he (King Janaka) went sportingly to a forest as Indra went to his garden Nandana in the intoxicating season of the spring where the cooing of the cuckoo was doing the dance number. The circumference of the forest was flowery. In it the damsels in the

form of the creepers were engaged in dalliance.”

Among the description of countries we may mention the one of Magadha which very well serves to bring out the beauty and affluence of it. We have it in the story of Dāsūra. The story opens with the description of the Magadha country:

*asty asmin vasudhāpīṭhe vicitrakusumadrumaḥ |
māgadho nāma vikhyātaḥ śrīmān janapado mahān ||*¹⁷

“There is a great, beautiful and well-known country on the surface of the earth, the abode of the people of Magadha, which has trees with variegated flowers.” The following three verses then describe in great details its excellence:

*kadambavanavistārālīlāvalitajaṅgalaḥ |
vicitravihagavyūhasarvāścaryamanoharaḥ ||
sasyasaṅkaṭasīmāntaḥ puropavanamaṇḍitaḥ |
kamalotpalakalhārāpūrṇasarvasarittitaḥ |
udyānadolāvilasal lalanāgeyaghumghumaḥ |
niśopabhuktakusumanīrandhraviśikhāvaniḥ ||*¹⁸

“Which was surrounding the forest as it were by its expanse of the Kadamba groves, which was captivating on account of all the wonders and flocks of strange birds; the bordering regions of which were full of grains adorned with cities and gardens; the banks of all the rivers of which were full of lotuses, the *utpalas* and the *kalhāras*; which was humming with the songs of the ladies sporting in the garden swings; wherein the earth had no space left on it on account of the arrows in the form of the flowers used in the night (by lovers).”

It is a beautiful description of the natural beauty and as well as the prosperity of the country. The country had a surplus in food with all-round plenty. What else could the people do except to lead a life of pleasure?

REFERENCES

1. III. 24.1

2. C. 11. 24.3. Sany Vrat Shastri Collection, New Delhi. Digitized by S3 Foundation USA

3. III. 28.53.
4. III. 28.62.
5. III. 28.19.
6. VI (ii) 181.14-15.
7. VI.(ii) 181.18-19.
8. VI (ii). 78.28.
9. VI (i) 106.47.
10. VI (i) 106.49-51.
11. VI (ii) 60.3-7.
12. VI (i). 106.39-42.
13. VI (i). 77. 12-16.
14. V. 8.1-3.
15. VI (i) 77.19-23.
16. V. 8.4-5.
17. IV. 48-9.
18. IV. 48.10-12.

The Anyoktis in the *Yogavāsiṣṭha*

Of the figures of speech *Anyokti* is one of which some of the most interesting examples are to be met with in the *Yogavāsiṣṭha*. *Anyokti* is an indirect way of saying things which is nevertheless effective. There are occasions when we do not want to say something directly to a person. It may be discourteous, may wound his vanity, may provoke his anger and embitter our relations with him. Similarly, if some pleasant references are made to a person at his very face it may tantamount to a crude form of sycophancy. To avoid this, a resort is made to the poetical device called *Anyokti*. Here, some other thing, may be a bird, a tree or for that matter any kind of natural phenomenon is employed as a medium through which the poet expresses his feelings. Besides this some thing other than directly addressed and spoken of is what is meant. It is another person who is in reality addressed and sought to be described. The oblique way of saying things has been very popular with Sanskrit poets. Sanskrit literature abounds in some of the finest *Anyoktis* which for their charm and appeal remain unrivalled. The *Anyoktis* of Paṇḍitarāja Jagannātha have become a household word in the Sanskrit field. Since ages the *Anyokti* form of poetry has caught the imagination of the people and the poets have been taking special delight in it. They have been taking to this form of writing even for the purpose of developing a point or enunciating a principle. It is for this purpose that a large number of *Anyoktis* have been written in Sanskrit. There are quite a good number of them written for another purpose too, viz., for praising the kings or patrons and

for deriding them. In the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* it is the latter variety of *Anyoktis* which is generally met with. There are, especially in the second half of the *Nirvāṇaprakaraṇa*, some of the finest *Anyoktis*, a few dealing with cuckoos, crows and other birds and a few others dealing with miscellaneous things. Some of the finest examples of the *Ānyoktis* are:

*kiṁ kiṁ kokila kūjasi drutaravaṁ harṣāt samullāsitaṁ
grīvakoṭarataḥ praveśaya punar mā bhūc ciraṁ te bhramaḥ
uddāmaiḥ kusumair niranatarataraṁ nedaṁ madhor jṛmbhitaṁ
hemantena kṛtās tuṣāranikaraiḥ śuṣkā amī pādapāḥ. ॥¹*

“O cuckoo, why are you crying aloud with joy? You should withdraw your cooings to the cavity of your throat. Do not be under an illusion for long. This is not the advent of the spring season which is characterized by the thickness of the wildly growing flowers. These trees have been made dry by winter by its masses of snow”.

In the above example a cuckoo is asked to stop its cooings for it is winter and not spring. The implication here is that there is a time and a place even for the sweetest expressions, such as the warbling of a cuckoo and that one should not go on telling the non-receptive audience of one's qualities and attainments etc. in a moment of excitement. When the people around are in no mood to listen or are otherwise not interested, one should better keep quiet and not waste one's breath; for words uttered inopportunely may not only be tasteless, but also distasteful. The same idea has been expressed in the following very interesting *Anyokti*:

*bhrātaḥ kokila kūjitair alam alaṁ nāyāty anarghyo guṇaḥ
tūṣṇīm āssva viśṛṇaparnāpaṭalacchanne kvacit koṭare ।
uddāmadrumakandare kaṭuraṭatkākāvalisamkulāḥ
kālo' yaṁ śiśirasya samprati sakhe nāyaṁ vasantotsavaḥ ॥²*

“O brother cuckoo ! stop your cooing. (For) hereby you do not acquire a precious quality. Keep mum (lying) somewhere in a hollow (of a tree) covered with a layer of withered leaves, in the recesses of the lofty trees. O friend, this is not the festival of

spring. It is the time of winter, full of rows of crows producing jarring notes.”

In the following verse too, the poet gives us an equally charming and interesting *Anyokti*. The idea that he wants to convey is that when a person is seen to be promising, many come forward to claim him for themselves. It is this clamour for owning him that presents the most disgusting sight. This idea is put by the poet in the form of the *Anyokti*. A young one of a cuckoo is, as soon as it tries to win the hearts of others by its sweet notes, claimed as its off-spring by a crow which makes a sudden appearance in a pleasure-grove where the audience which had begun to enjoy the sweet notes of the cuckoo, feels perturbed and disappointed. The verse which presents this *Anyokti* runs thus:

*vācā komalayā sukokilaśiṣuḥ kalyāṇakalpām kathām
sarvāvarjanam ārjavena kurute yāvat puro rāgiṇām |
tāvan mattanayo 'yam ity avirataṁ drāṅkārabhūmāravair
dhvāṅkṣeṇopavane nipatya nabhasaḥ sarve kṛtā nīrasāḥ ||³*

“As soon as the young one of a cuckoo with its tender notes makes in all its innocence a blissful utterance captivating one and all in the presence of music-loving, anxious audience, there appears from the sky quite suddenly a crow which with its ceaseless harsh cries claims it to be its own off-spring. At this every body present in the garden feels upset and sad”.

Another verse where a cuckoo is used as the medium of the *Anyokti* is as follows:

*śrotrotsavam tava kalam kalakaṇṭha ko 'tra
nādam śṛṇoti iti vighrahasandhidūtam |
kākair ulūkakalahair iha gulmakeṣu
kreṅkāraghargharavaiḥ śrutir āgatāstam ||⁴*

“O sweet-throated cuckoo ! who is there to listen to your sweet notes, the feast to the ears, the harbinger of peace in love quarrels? Here in these shrubs the ears have become deafened by the fights among crows and owls.”

The idea in the above example is that the din and turmoil that is raised by the petty people is responsible many a time for turning

the people's minds away from the finer things of life. The author has been able to give expression to this idea most effectively. It could not have been better expressed.

Of the *Anyoktis* where a crow is employed as the medium for propounding some truth, mention may here be made of the two which are found in the canto one hundred and sixteenth of the second half of the sixth book which has preserved for us a few of the finest *Anyoktis* of the Sanskrit literature. One such we have where a crow is said to cause headache to a person by drowning the humming of the bees by its harsh cries. The verse purports to convey the idea that a loud noise very often drowns sweet words of reason. A wise man may not be able to create a loud noise. In his soft accents he may say some words of profound wisdom which may go unheard, drowned by the thunders of the fools. This is really the most distressing sight. A sensible man cannot but feel sorry for this state of affairs in society where those who speak the loudest come to hold the stage while the others, profoundly learned and immensely wise are elbowed out. Nobody listens to them or rather, nobody is allowed to listen to them. The verse where this interesting *Anyokti* is found is:

kākaka kaṭukalkārava
kavalitagūṇa kardame bhraman sarasi |
antarayasi madhuparavaṁ
yad ato me śirasi phalabhūtaḥ || 5

"O you wretch of a crow! since you have swallowed up the virtues (of the swan and others) with your harsh worthless cries, and since you drown the humming of the bees (by your loud noise), while moving about in the mud of a pond, you are a source of headache to me".

The second one is where an interesting question is put to a crow. We see that a crow is by nature very suspicious. It does not tolerate its share being taken by birds other than those of its own species. But when it comes to the young one of a cuckoo all its cleverness departs and it begins to rear it as its own off-spring. This makes it a butt of ridicule. The idea is that you may be very discreet about things in general but when it comes to a thing

which you are fond of, for which you have a passion, all your reason may forsake you. Love of offspring is a passion common to all alike. This *Anyokti* is found in the following verse:

*he kāka karkaśarava krakacaikacihna
iādṛk svaśaṅkanam api kva nu te' dya yātam ।
kasmād anarthakam idaṁ pikapākam eka-
putrāśayā tad api te hy upahāsasiddhyai ॥*⁶

“O you crow! you caw harshly and share the distinctive nature of a saw (you are as sharp as saw). Where has gone today that apprehensiveness of yours that you are bringing up uselessly this young one of a cuckoo in the hope of obtaining only one offspring, which Nature has vouchsafed to you, you being *ekaputra* or *sakṛtpraja*. This makes you a fit object for ridicule.”

Of the *Anyoktis* having a cloud as the medium, mention may be made here of the two which are so interesting and remarkable that they can stand comparison with some of the very best of their kind in the whole of the Sanskrit literature. One of them is:

*śrīmadvṛtta mahāśayātāpahara proccair gabhīrākṛte
bhūbhṛnmūrdhasu bhūṣaṇaṁ bhavasi bho bhūme
rasaikāspadam ।
etat tu kṣapayen manāṁsi yad idaṁ megha tvayā varṣatā
harṣād ūṣarapalvalasthalataruṣv ambhovibhāgakramah ॥*⁷

“O cloud! you are an ornament on the heads of the mountains. You are a source of water on the earth. You have a brilliant conduct. You are magnanimous. You remove the heat. Your appearance is very solemn. But (inspite of all these qualities) this will cause pain to the minds of the people while you send showers in the state of joy, you divide your waters equally between fallow lands, ponds, land trees.”

In other words in the garb of a cloud, a person is reproached here, who, while giving does not make distinction between the deserving and the undeserving. If a person like a cloud which pours its waters at a place where they are not wanted and go waste, gives liberally without giving due thought to the qualities and the requirements of the person who receives the gift, he

cannot earn a good name. His charity may be misused by the unscrupulous and in that case the donor cannot escape the blame, however, well-meaning he may be. While doing a good turn pick-and-choose is really necessary. When there is such pick-and-choose then the good work done by the donor will earn him the appreciation of all and the possibility of a good thing leading to evil results would also be obviated. The second is:

*nityam snāsi sūtrhavārivisarair uccaiḥ padastho 'mbuda
śuddhaḥ san vipināvanau nivasasi prārabdhamānavrataḥ ।
riktasyā py atikāntir eva bhavataḥ kāyāśrayā lakṣyate
protthāyāśanim ātanoṣi kim idaṁ tucchaṁ tavāceṣṭitam ॥*

"O cloud! you always take bath in the expansive waters of the holy places sitting high up. Thus purified, you undertake a vow of silence and live in forest lands. Even when you are emptied of your contents, your body appears very lustrous. (But) what is this mean act of yours that you get up and produce (smashing) lightning and thunder (thundering noise)?"

In the above verse in the garb of the cloud somebody is reproached for inconsistency in, and impropriety of conduct and that is what makes it an *Anyokti*. A person may be virtuous, pure, self-restrained and generous. His conduct should consist of these virtues. When generous, he should be sweet as well. He should not preface his act of making gifts with harsh words for the recipients. These will humiliate them and will take the grace out of his charity. As a matter of fact, the works on social ethics point out that while giving something in charity one should not be actuated even by an element of pity for the supplicant. Even that is considered undesirable, but if, in addition to this, one were to use harsh words, that would certainly be uncharitable.

Another verse which employs a crow for an *Anyokti* is as follows:

*ālokyā pañkajavane savilāsavantam
kākaṁ kalaṅkasadr̥śam bhr̥śam āraṇtam ।
hā kaṣṭhaśabdaśatanaṣṭaviceṣṭito yo
no roditi krakacakena vidāryatām saḥ ॥*

“Seeing a crow looking like a dark spot, sporting in a lotus-bed and continuously crying, a person who, though rendered inactive by hundreds of jarring notes, does not weep, let him be torn asunder by a saw.”

The implication of the *Anyokti* in the above verse is that the sight of a mean and ignoble person occupying a place, which in the fitness of things belongs to the noble, and acting disgustfully should sadden and distress any sensible person. A person who remains unmoved, deserves all contempt and condemnation.

There are a few beautiful and charming *Anyoktis* of *Ākāśa* or the sky in the *Yogavāsiṣṭha*. In one of these the sky, though possessing all good qualities is said to have one bad thing about it, which is, that it sheds burning heat. The idea is that a person should be good-natured, amiable and sweet apart from his being possessed of many other qualities and merits. But if he is not amiable and flies into rage, thereby creating unnecessary heat, all his other qualities will be of no avail. The absence of this one quality is enough to lower him in public estimation. This interesting *Anyokti* is found in the following verse:

*kalpābhradrumavīrudunnatidṛśām kartāsi dhartāsi ca
ākāśendughanārkakinnaramarutskandhāmarāṇām api ।
sarvaṁ ramyaṁ asaṅkulāśaya samasvacchasvabhāvasya te
yat tv etad dahanatvam aṅga tad aho mukhyāya khedāya
naḥ!!¹⁰*

“O sky! you lead to the growth of trees, creepers and bring forth clouds at the time of universal destruction and you sustain the moon, the sun, the *Kinnaras*, the *Marut-Skandhas* and the gods. O magnanimous one, of you who have even and clean nature everything else is charming, but that you shed burning heat is the cause of our great torment.”

We have another equally beautiful *Anyokti* of the sky. The sky and through that medium some other thing also is the object of censure here. The sky merits censure, for it allows a cloud to rest on it and send down a shower of hail for pounding people below, implying that, however, high and noble a person may be he, should not allow others, who may use his patronage for

oppressing the people, to surround him. They will bring him a bad name. These underlings very often prove the greatest drags on the reputation and the prestige of the highplaced persons who may have personally nothing reproachable about them. It is not an uncommon sight in this world to see the petty officials of the village and district levels working under the protective shadows of their superiors or the provincial government bringing disrepute to the entire administrative machinery by their oppressive acts and third-degree methods. That these small fry are allowed protection by the superiors proves the greatest weakness of them. Such a beautiful all-time truth is enunciated by the author in the following verse:

*ākāśa kāśam asi nirmalam accham uccair-
ādhāra unnatayatottamam uttamānām |
tvām etya kin tu viralam karakāghano 'yam
lokaṁ vimardayati tena paro 'si nīcāḥ ||*¹¹

“O sky ! you are shining, pure and clean. On account of your loftiness you are the substratum of the best. But you are the meanest of all too, because considering that you have a space, a hail-showering cloud resorts to you and pounds the people (by a shower of hail).

Yet another similarly interesting *Anyokti* is found in the verse:

*ākāśa karṣakaśa eva nikarṣaṇaṁ te
manyē ciraṁ samucitaṁ na tu kiñcid anyat |
śūnyo 'si yaj jaladhararkṣavimāṇacandra-
sūryānilān vahaśi bhāsi na cārthaśūnyaḥ ||*¹²

“O sky! I think, what is proper for you is that you should be rubbed for quite sometime on the touch-stone and nothing else, for even though a void you carry on you the clouds, the stars, the aerial cars, the moon, the sun and the air and thus appear not to be a void”.

The poet means to say that the nature of things and persons is sometimes difficult to ascertain. Particularly the nature of the great is inscrutable. It is undefinable, for it is tinctured by inconsistencies, by the opposites which go ill together. Apparently

stern, a great person may be really gentle; apparently callous, he may be full of the milk of human kindness; apparently short-sighted, he may be really far-sighted, seeing things beyond the ken of ordinary mortals. Surely his nature is a complex which defies analysis and baffles comprehension. Truly has the poet Bhavabhūti observed:

*vajrād api kaṭhorāṇi mṛdūni kusumād api ।
lokottarāṇāṃ cetāṃsi ko nu vijñātum arhati ॥¹³*

“Who can understand the heart of the great people which is at once harder than a thunderbolt and softer than a flower?”

It is in this context that the authors of the Dharmasūtras declare: *na devacaritaṃ caret*.

After this we have an interesting *Anyokti* where the sky is said to assume a number of forms and by so doing suggests a clever person whose ways are rather unpredictable. Even the wise will not be able to predict his movements. His mind will run in devious ways. He will adopt different postures in different places. What his real self is nobody will ever be able to find out. His character and conduct will always remain an enigma, however closely and minutely he may be watched. This fundamental truth is expressed in the *Yogavāsīṣṭha* in the following verse:

*ahni prakāśam asi raktavapur dinānte
yāmāsu kṛṣṇam atha cākhilavasturiktam ।
nityaṃ na kiñcid api sad vahasīti māyāṃ
na vyoma veti viduṣo 'pi viceṣṭitaṃ te ॥¹⁴*

“You are resplendent by day, assume a red form in the evening, are dark and empty, (as it were) of all things at night. Although you are ever nothing, you always carry (the stars, the moon etc.) on you. O sky, even though you are wise nobody knows your clever movements”.

Apart from the *Anyoktis* cited above there are many others which are no less interesting and charming. As a matter of fact, nearly the whole of the one hundred and sixteenth canto of the sixth book is replete with verses which approximate in character to the *Anyokti*. This very well helps bring out the author's love

for *Anyoktis* in which he is seen to be in his top-form. The language and the style of the *Anyokti* verses is simply excellent and is a pattern for the later age when poets like Paṇḍitarāja Jagannātha enriched the Sanskrit literature with their *Anyoktis* some of which have passed into common use.

REFERENCES

1. vi (ii), 116.77.
2. vi (ii), 215.80.
3. vi (vi). 116.76
4. vi (ii) 116.75
5. vi. (ii). 116.63.
6. vi (ii). 116.70
7. 2. vi. (ii) 116.50.
8. vi (ii). 186.51.
9. V (ii) 116.71
10. VI. (ii) 116.14.
11. VI. (ii) 116.15.
12. VI (ii) 116.16
13. *Uttararāmacarita*, II.7.
14. VI (ii) 116.17:

IV KĀLIDĀSA STUDIES

1

The *Kumārasambhava*—Its Genuine Portion

The *Kumārasambhava* (K.S.) as available at present has seventeen cantos which carry on them the commentary *Sanjīvanī* by Mallinātha on Cantos I-VIII and by Sītārama Kavi on Cantos IX-XVII. The expression in all these is not the same, giving rise, therefore, to a controversy, not yet fully resolved, as to whether the whole of the work is that of Kālidāsa or a certain portion of it. A fairly good number of scholars is of the opinion that the genuine portion of the work is upto Canto VIII only, after which it is all interpolation. And there are powerful arguments for it. Later scholars like Bhaṭṭojidīkṣita, Mammaṭa and Ānandavardhana in their discussions on certain words, themes and figures of speech have given quotations from the work upto Canto VIII only thereby giving rise to the conjecture that in their time the work had these cantos only and not upto Canto XVII or they did not accept cantos IX to XVII as genuine to draw their material on.

Bhaṭṭojidīkṣita has referred to the K.S. a number of times: *giriśaṃ upacacāra* (K.S. I.60), *viśavr̥kṣo 'pi saṃvardhya* (II.55), *tulām yadārohati dantavāsasā* (V. 34), *vimānanā subhru* (V.43), *vijñāpanā bhartṛṣu* (VII.93), *dūrayaty avanate vivasvati* (VIII.31), *pīvaroru pibatīva barhiṇaḥ* (VIII.36), *śārvarasya tamasaḥ* (VIII. 57).

Śaraṇadeva has referred to the K.S. thirty times to justify the apparently unjustifiable words. And each time it has been from within the portion upto Cantos VIII only.

Appayyadīkṣita (in his *Citramīmāṃsā*) has quoted twelve,

Ānandavardhana six and Mammaṭa nine stanzas from the *K.S.* and all these are from the first eight cantos only.

A point well-noticed by scholars already against the portion of the *K.S.* beyond Canto VIII as genuine is that Mallinātha has not commented on it.

An examination of the two portions of the *K.S.* also leads to the same conclusion. The first portion (upto Canto VIII) has no frequentative form while the second (from Cantos IX-XVII) has a few of them e.g. *lelihāna* (XVI.16), *dodhūyamāna* (XVII.30), *dandahyamāna* (XVII.39).

The first portion does not have a word with *akac* while the second one has it: *ahakapramukhyān* (XII.46). The second portion furnishes instances of hiatus when followed by *o* enjoined by Pāṇinī by *ot* (1.1.15), e.g. *aho aho devagaṇāḥ* (XII. 54), *atho acumbat* (XIII.19), *itthaṁ vilokya surasainyam atho aśeṣam* (XVII.33) while the first portion has nothing of the kind. The words *giriśa* and *praphulla* occur four times each in the first portion: *giriśena paścāt* (I.37), *giriśo'numene* (I.59), *giriśam upacacāra* (I.60), *giriśāya gaurī* (III.65), *praphullarājīvam ivāṅkamadhye* (III.45), *praphullakāśā vasudheva reje* (VII.11), *praphullavṛkṣaiḥ kaṭakair iva svaiḥ* (VII.52), *praphullacakṣuḥ kumudaḥ kumāryā* (VII.74), while they just do not figure in the second. Unlike the first portion there is tautology in the second, e.g. *ratānandasukhasya* (IX.16), *adhikakāntikāntaḥ* (XIII,8) *vihārahelāgatibhiḥ* (IX.37), *nirdagdham ātmano dehaṁ durvahaṁ voḍhum akṣamaḥ* (X.13.), *sāndrapramodayasaukhyahetu-bhūtam* (X.19), *kalahakelikutūhalotkam* (XVII.12.). There is a whole lot of made-up words in the second, particularly with reference to Kumāra (Skanda), Indra and Candra but not in the first section.

Made-up words for Kumāra

Smarārātisutaḥ (XII.47), *Andhakārātisutasya* (XIII.17.), *Adriputrīmaheśaputrāya* (XIII. 29), *Smarasātrūsūnuḥ* (XIII. 33), *Śailasutātānūjah* (XIII. 45), *Andhakaśatrūsūnunā* (XIV. 1), *Andhakadveṣitanūjam* (XIV. 8), *Tripurāntakātmajam* (XIV. 9),

Manmathamardanātmajam (XV.2), *Manmathaśatrusūnūnā* (XV.3), *Smarārisūnoḥ* (XV.38, 40; XVII.6), *Purārisūnoḥ* (XV.49; XVII.7), *Tripurāriputram* (XVII.18), *Makaradhvaśatrusūnum* (XVII.46), *Tripurārisūnum* (XVII.48), *Viṣamaśarāreḥ sūnuna* (XVII.55).

Made-up word for Indra

Pulomaputrīdayitaḥ (XII. 22; XIII. 9)

Made-up word for Candra (moon)

Triyāmāramaṇaḥ (XIII. 8)

Unlike his successors like Bhāravi and Māgha, Kālidāsa is not in the habit of using unfamiliar words. Occurrence of some of them like, *kṛpīṭayoni* (X. 16) for fire, *saṅkrandana* (XII. 3) for Indra, *Kāsara* (XIV. 7) for he-buffalo in the second part is a clear departure from the Kālidāsan practice. So is the eulogy for the celestial Gaṅgā (X. 28-36) which is reminiscent of later *stotra* type of poetry.

Along with tautology could be mentioned unnecessary padding which is noticeable in the second portion. In *Tripurāsurāri* (XIII. 20), the word *asura* is unnecessary. Śiva is always called *Tripurāri*. *Asura* is just a padding here. In *raṇapravīro hi surān avocat* (XIII. 13.), *hi* is superfluous-though the commentaries like *Śiśutoṣinī* have tried to offer justification for it by pointing out that it denotes certainty, *hi niścayaḥ* which, however, is a weak defence. The use of *hi* in the present case is not in the same strain as *in kleśaḥ phalena hi punar navatām vidhatte*.

Kālidāsa is known for his similes which have a charm of their own. He is very frequent with them as also very original. While there are numerous similes in the first portion, there are just six of them in the second which considering its volume is rather a small number and they too lack the charm and the felicity of those in the first as also Kālidāsa's other works.

In the case of a son, Kālidāsa's practice, as noticeable in his various works is that he either relates him to the father or the

mother but never to both, e.g. *babhūva bhāveṣu dilīpanandanah* (*Raghuvamśa*, III. 41); *dilīpasūnoḥ sa brhadbhujāntaram* (III. 54); *sudakṣiṇāsūnur api nyavartata* (III. 67); *dausyantim apratiratham* (*Abhijñānaśākuntala*, IV. 20); *kaccid abhinanditas tvayā eṣa śākuntaleyaḥ* (VII. 32/33) where Raghu is referred to as the son of Dilīpa or of Sudakṣiṇā, and Bharata of Duṣyanta or of Śākuntalā. The same practice is met with in the first portion of the *K.S.* where Pārvaṭī is spoken of as the daughter of the mountain (*Himālaya*) *śailātmajā*, *adritanayā* and so on. In the second portion, however, Kumāra (*Kārttikeya*) is spoken of as the son of Śiva and Pārvaṭī, not always as the son of either Śiva or of Pārvaṭī which should have been the case keeping in view the Kālidāsa practice, e.g. *maheśādrisutāsutasya* (XI. 39); *girīśagaurītanayena* (XIII. 9); *adriputrīmaheśaputrāya* (XIII. 29); *tanayo'si girīśagauryoḥ* (XVII. 14).

One more argument against Kālidāsa having composed the work upto Canto XVII could be that instead of naming his work *K.S.*, he would have named it, keeping in view the victory over the villain, *Tārakavadha* like the Prakrit works *Kāmsavaho*, *Gauḍavaho* or named it *Tārakavijaya*, victory over Tāraka, in line with the titles like *Haravijaya*.

It may well be argued here as to how the work could be named *K.S.*, the birth of Kumāra, if the genuine portion of it is to be accepted to be upto Canto VIII only, for it does not describe the birth of Kumāra. The answer to this could be that with the marriage of Śiva and Pārvaṭī and their union, the birth of a son could be an obvious deduction.

All this would point to the portion upto Canto VIII being that of Kālidāsa. What follows might well have been composed by a later writer who ascribed it to the master poet to ensure its perpetuity.

Yajñas (Sacrifices) in Kālidāsa

The works of Kālidāsa are replete with reference to sacrifices or things connected with them. This should not be unusual in view of his description of hermitages and penance groves with ascetics for whom performance of sacrifices was a matter of course. Then there were kings who organized big sacrifices which would last long and to which they would invite important sages and seers of the time. They would either do so for the fulfilment of some wish like the birth of a son or to proclaim their supremacy among contemporary kings.

Kālidāsa must have lived in an age when he would have seen columns of smoke going up the sky and heard of the chant of the Vedic *mantras* to enable him to describe them with a certain intimacy. A major part of his themes he has laid in penance groves, Tapovanas or hermitages, Āśramas of Kaṇva, Mārīca and other sages. Duṣyanta, the king of Hastināpura, reaches it in course of hunting. The Āśramites come to know of this and send him the sons of the Ṛṣis, the Ṛṣikumāras, with the request that he should stay in the Āśrama for a few days. The reason: On account of the absence of Kulapati Kaṇva the demons are causing obstructions to their sacrifices: *tatrabhavataḥ kulapater asānnidhyād rakṣāṃsi na iṣṭivighnam utpādayanti*¹. The king agrees. The sacrifices go on, the king taking care of the hindrances. As they conclude, he is sent off by the sages for his capital: *adya rājarṣir iṣṭim samāpya ṛṣibhir visarjitah*.....²

For the performance of the sacrifice an altar, Vedi, was laid, around which was placed the sacred Kuśa grass. The Rtyiis or

the sacrificial priests would then light the fire and pour oblations into it. A pupil of the sacrificer, the Yajamānaśiṣya, in the *Abhijñānaśākuntala* is shown carrying the Kuśa grass which he is to pass on to the sacrificial priests: *yāvad imān vedisaṃs-taraṇārthaṃ darbhān ṛtvigbhya upanayāmi*³.

Back in his Āśrama, Kaṇva arranges for sending Śakuntalā to her husband's home. At the time of her departure he asks her to walk round the fires to which sacrifice had just been offered: *itaḥ sadyohutāgnīn pradakṣiṇīkuruṣva*⁴. He then blesses her in R̥gvedic metre: *ṛkchandasā 'śāste*—'May these sacrificial fires having their places assigned them round the altar with sacrificial sticks offered to them and the Kuśa grass strewn round them, chasing away evil with the odours of sacrificial offerings, purify you:

*amī vedīm paritaḥ klptadhiṣṇyāḥ
samidvantāḥ prāntasaṃstīrṇadarbhāḥ |
apaghnanto duritaṃ havyavāhair
vaitānās tvām vahnayaḥ pāvayantu ||*⁵

The plural number in sacrificial fires, *vahnayaḥ*, is indicative here of more than one fire. It probably refers to three that are usually worshipped by the Agnihottrins: the Gārhapatya, the Dakṣiṇāgni and the Ahavaniya which are collectively called Tretā according to Manu⁶. Kālidāsa too calls them as such in describing the smoke filling the path of Rāma's aerial car on his return from Laṅkā to Ayodhyā:

*tretāgnidhūmāgram anindyakīrtes
tasyedam ākrāntavimānamārgam |
ghrātvā havirgandhi rajovimuktaḥ
samaśnute me laghimānam ātmā ||*⁷

and in describing the three brothers of Rāma as having the lustre of three fires: *itare 'pi raghor vaṃśyās trayas tretāgnitejasah*⁸. There is indirect reference to three fires when Kautsa approaching Raghu is told by him to wait like the fourth fire for two or three days in his fire sanctuary: *vasaś caturtho 'gnir ivāgnyagāre*⁹.

It is only once that Kālidāsa in his works gives the number of fires as four and that is in the context of the description of the

sage Sutīkṣṇa who is spoken of as practising penance in the midst of four fires: *havirbhujām edhavatām caturṇām madhye asau tapasyati*¹⁰.

Kaṇva's statement that the fires have their assigned places on the altar agrees very well with the Vedic practice. The Gārhapatya is situated in the middle of the western part of the Vedi, the Dakṣiṇāgni is near the south-western corner of it and the Āhavanīya is at the eastern end of it.

Every Agnihotrin or worshipper of fire in days of yore had a separate room, or if circumstances permitted, a house dedicated to the holy fires. Kālidāsa refers to this in three places, one, when the incorporeal metrical speech informs Kaṇva of Śakuntalā's marriage as he had entered the fire sanctuary: *agniśaraṇam praviṣṭasya śarīram vinā chandomayyā vācā*¹¹, the second time, when Duṣyanta asks his staff-bearer Vetravati to lead the way to the fire-sanctuary where he is to receive the pupils of Kaṇva and Gautamī who had escorted Śakuntalā to him: *Vetravati! agniśaraṇamārgam ādeśaya*¹² and the third time when Raghu asks Kautsa to wait for three or four days in the fire-sanctuary while he would endeavour to accomplish his object: *vasaś caturtho 'gnir ivāgnyagāre ... dvitrāṇy ahāny arhasi sodhum*.¹³ Now, the word used in the *Abhijñānaśākuntala* for fire-sanctuary is *agniśaraṇa* while that used in the *Raghuvamśa* is *agnyagāra*. Both have the same meaning of a house for sacred fires. One of the alternative meanings of *agāra* is house. Kālidāsa uses it in this sense in the *Meghadūta*: *tatrāgāram dhanapatigṛhān uttareṇāsmadīyam*.¹⁴

As per tradition, offerings in the sacrifices go to the deities who are called for that reason *havirbhuj*. In the *Abhijñānaśākuntala* even the sage couple Dākṣāyaṇī and Mārīca in whose Āśrama Śakuntalā takes shelter after her repudiation by her husband is called so. Not only that, it is said to be the foremost among them: *yajñabhāgeśvaram...*¹⁵ *dvandvam dakṣamarīcisambhavam*. In the *Kumārasambhava* even the mount Himālaya is assigned that position: *yajñabhāgajuṣām madhye padam atasthuṣa tvayā*.¹⁶

Though the Ṛṣis could, through their spiritual power itself, ward off obstructions to their sacrifices from demons wont to disrupt them, they would normally not like to do so for fear of its depletion. Raghu specifically enquires from Kautsa whether his preceptor Varatantu has not to spend his threefold penance treasured up by him to remove impediments. The normal course for the ascetics was to approach the rulers of the time and to request them for protection. It was only when that was not available that they would strike the disruptor with their curse-arm and spend their penance: *trāṇābhāve hi śāpāstrāḥ kurvanti tapaso vyayam.*¹⁷

The theme of the rulers or their sons being called upon by ascetics to afford them protection is taken up by Kālidāsa in two of his works, in the *Abhijñānaśākuntala* as noted above as also the time when Duṣyanta hears a call informing him that while the vesper sacrifices, the *savanakarman*, are commenced, the shadows of flesheaters are inspiring terror in various ways: *savanakarmani sampravṛtte chāyās caranti bahudhā bhayam ādadhānāḥ....piṣitāśanānām*¹⁸ and in the *Raghuvamśa* at two places, first time when the sage Viśvāmitra approaches King Daśaratha to spare Rāma for him to remove obstruction to his sacrifice: *kausikena kila sa kṣitīśvaro rāmam adhvaravighāta-śāntaye... yācitah*¹⁹ who together with Lakṣmaṇa afforded him protection while he had entered upon the initiatory ceremonies of the sacrifice: *tatra dīkṣitam ṛṣim rarakṣatuḥ*²⁰ with the result that the priests were able to complete his (Viśvāmitra's), while he was observing silence, sacrificial rites in due order: *ṛtvijaḥ kulapater yathākramam vāgyatasya niravartayan kriyāḥ*²¹ and the other time when the sages living on the banks of the Yamunā with their sacrifice disrupted by Lavaṇa came to Rāma for protection:

*lavaṇena vilupte jyaś tāmīreṇa tam abhyayuh |
munayo yamunābhājāḥ saranyam śaraṇārthinaḥ |*²²

The sages did have their power of asceticism which could afford them protection but they thought that since Rāma was there, there was no need for them to do so and attack Lavaṇa with it: *avekṣya rāmam te tasmīn na prajānuḥ svatejasā,*²³ for, in the

absence of a protector only do the curse-armed ones expend their ascetic virtue: *trāṇābhāve hi śāpāstrāḥ kurvanti tapaso vyayam*.

While enumerating the qualities of the scions of the race of Raghu Kālidāsa mentions one which is particularly relevant to the present study. It is their offering oblations to fire according to prescribed rules: *yathāvidhihutāgninām*.²⁴ Dilipa going to Vasiṣṭha to enquire of the cause of his issuelessness and to know the means to be out of it mentions to him his obscured state for want of an issue, *prajālopanimīlitaḥ*,²⁵ though he is purified by sacrifices, *ijyāviśuddhātma*.²⁶ The sacrifices may not only serve the purpose of self-purification, they may also lead to material prosperity. Dilipa mentions to Vasiṣṭha that the oblation duly offered by him to the holy fires turns into rain for nourishing the crops which otherwise would wither by drought:

*haviṛ āvarjitaṃ hotas tvayā vidhivad agniṣu |
vṛṣṭir bhavati sasyānam avagrahaviśoṣinām* |²⁷

The *mantras* that he, their revealer, the *mantrakṛt*,²⁸ the repository of the Atharva lore, *atharvanidhiḥ*,²⁹ utters keeps the enemy away and accounts for the welfare of the people.

Since ghee was the principal offering in the sacrifices, the cow, the means of obtaining it, had an importance of its own for the sacrifice. It is said to be the *āhutisādhana*, the source of oblation, for the *hotṛ*,³⁰ the sacrificer, who maintains the sacrificial fire: *āhitāgni*.³¹

In addition to making a general observation like *agnicit*, one who has consecrated the sacred fires as in the case of Aja³² or *yajvan*,³³ sacrificer as in the case of Kṣemadhanvan Kālidāsa mentions a number of kings having performed certain specific sacrifices. Dilipa performed ninety-nine Aśvamedhas³⁴ and, though he could not perform the hundredth one; his horse guarded by his son Raghu having been taken away by Indra who would not part with it, (though challenged by the former, not wanting the nomenclature of Śatakratu to pass on to someone else); he got its full reward.³⁵ Daśaratha performed the Putreṣṭi sacrifice for begetting sons.³⁶ Raghu performed the Viśvajit sacrifice wherein he gave away in charity all his possessions.³⁷ Rāma performed

the Aśvamedha sacrifice³⁸ wherein he placed the figure of exiled Sītā in gold by his side.³⁹ Sītā's father Janaka performed a sacrifice, name not given, but inferable to be Aśvamedha because of the mention of Yūpa in a reference to its conclusion: *yūpavatya avasite kriyāvidhau*⁴⁰ and its mention by the word *kratu* with which it is referred to elsewhere, to which he had invited the sage Viśvāmitra: *taṁ nyamantrayata sambhṛtakratur maithilaḥ*⁴¹ who had taken Rāma also with him. It was there that the incident of the lifting of the bow and its breaking had led to the marriage of Rāma with Sītā.

There is reference by Rāma to the Aśvamedha intended to be performed in the context of the ocean having been enlarged by his ancestors when they had dug into the earth in search of the sacrificial horse of their father that had been taken down by the sage Kapila to the nether regions:

*guror yiyakṣoḥ kapilena medhye
rasātalaṁ saṅkramite turaṅge |
tadartham urvīm avadārayadbhiḥ
pūrvaiḥ kilāyaṁ parivardhito naḥ ||*⁴²

Rāma's grandson Atithi is also described to have performed the Aśvamedha sacrifice, *jigīṣor aśvamedhāya*⁴³, and that is incidentally the last reference to Aśvamedha in the *Raghuvamśa*.

Since the Aśvamedha involved the killing of the horse, it was but natural that Kālidāsa should have made a frequent reference to the Yūpa, the sacrificial post, to which the animal was tied before it was slaughtered.

The Yogin Kārtavīrya is said to have fixed sacrificial posts in eighteen continents:

aṣṭādaśadvīpanikhātayūpaḥ

.....

*babhūva yogī kila kārtavīryaḥ ||*⁴⁴

The sacrificial ceremony performed by Janaka consisted of the Yūpa: *yūpavatya avasite kriyāvidhau*⁴⁵, Daśaratha is said to have made the banks of the rivers Tamasā and Sarayū glisten with the lofty golden Yūpas.

*kratuṣu tena visarjitamaulinā
bhujasamāhṛtadigvasunā kṛtāḥ |
kanakayūpasamucchrayaśobhino
vitamasā tamasāsarayūtātāḥ |*⁴⁶

Rāma in the aerial car points to Sītā the banks of the river Sarayū flowing by Ayodhyā lined all along by the sacrificial posts, the Yūpas⁴⁷. The mention is in the context of the horse sacrifice, the *turaṅgamedha*⁴⁸.

Rāma's son Kuśa on his way back to Ayodhyā to shift his capital to it saw on reaching the banks of the Sarayū hundreds of Yūpas, with square pavements for their pedestals, of the descendants of Raghu having performed sacrifices:

*ity adhvanah kaiścid ahobhir ante
kūlam samāsādya kuśah sarayvāḥ |
vedipratiṣṭhān vitatādhvarāṇām
yūpān apaśyac chataśo raghūṇām |*⁴⁹

Śiva in the guise of a Brahmacārīn while dissuading Pārvatī from her resolve to win him for her, says that the good do not accord a stake, *śūla*, in the cremation ground the Vedic honour due to a sacrificial post: *apekṣyate sādhujanena vaidikī śmaśānaśūlasya na yūpasatkriyā*.⁵⁰

If it was *Asvamedha*, the animal killed was horse. If it was *Gomedha*, it could even be cow. King Rantideva is mentioned by Kālidāsa to have slaughtered cows. The cloud in the *Meghadūta* is asked to tarry for a while on the river (*Carmanvatī*) to do honour to the glory of the king that had appeared on the earth in the form of a river:

*vyālabethāḥ surabhitānāyālabhajāṃ mānayaṣyan
srotomūrtyā bhuvi pariṇatām rantidevasya kīrtim |*⁵¹

Rāma in the aerial car while overflying the forests also draws Sītā's attention to a number of Āśramas and Tapovanas of the Ṛṣis giving his comments on their preoccupation with the sacrifices. The ascetic Sūtikṣṇa he mentions as practising penance in the midst of the four fires fed with fuel: *havirbhujām edhavatām caturṇām madhye*⁵². The sage Śarabhaṅga after keeping the sacred

fire and after continuing to propitiate it with sacred fuel for long, *cirāya santarpya samiddhbir agnim*, at last offered his body consecrated with *mantras* to it:

yo mantrapūtām tanum apy ahaṣīt 11⁵³

The ablution at the conclusion of the sacrifice called *avabhṛtha* is referred to by Kālidāsa at more than one place, once in the context of the mention of Nandinī's milk which was said to be more sanctifying than it (the *avabhṛtha*): *bhuvanṁ koṣṇena kuṇḍodhnī medhyenāvabhṛthād api*⁵⁴, the second time in the context of Daśaratha having had it: *avabhṛthaprayataḥ*⁵⁵, the third time Viśvāmitra having had it: *avabhṛthāpluto muniḥ*⁵⁶ and the fourth time in the context of Rāma's mention of the Ikṣvākus having had it: *turaṅgamedhāvabhṛthāvatrṇair ikṣvākubhiḥ*⁵⁷.

Kālidāsa uses a number of words for sacrifice: *yajña*,⁵⁸ *ijyā*,⁵⁹ *homa*,⁶⁰ *adhvara*,⁶¹ *kratu*,⁶² *makha*,⁶³ *iṣṭi*,⁶⁴ and *vitāna* the last one identifiable from its derivative Taddhita use *vaitāna* found first in the context of the sacred water *vaitānikam śāntiyudakam*⁶⁵ and the other time at Śakuntalā's circumambulation of the sacred fires *vaitānā vahnayaḥ*⁶⁶. Sometimes the idea of the sacrifice or sacrificial rites is just conveyed by the general word *kriyā*, act. Dilipa asking the lion to accept him in lieu of the cow says by doing so neither the means for the sacrifice of the Muni (Vasiṣṭha) would be destroyed, *bhaved aluptaś ca muneḥ kriyārthaḥ*⁶⁷, nor would the dinner-after-fast of his be violated. Raghu while asking Indra as to why he should cause obstruction to the sacrifice of his father also uses this word: *madguroḥ kriyāvighātāya katham pravartase*⁶⁸. After Rāma had removed the obstruction by demons, the sacrificers were able to perform the sacrificial rites for Viśvāmitra. In this context too the same word figures: *ṛtvijāḥ kulapater yathākramam vāgyatasya niravartayan kriyāḥ*⁶⁹. So does it figure in connection with the mention of the conclusion of the sacrificial rites of Janaka: *yūpavaty avasite kriyāvidhau*⁷⁰. Once a while even the word *karman* appears to carry the meaning of sacrifice or sacrificial ceremonies. When Agnivarna was ill, his ministers made out to the suspecting subjects that he was engaged in performing sacrificial ceremonies for the birth of a

son: *bāḍham eṣu divaseṣu pārthivaḥ karma sādhayati putrajanmane*⁷¹. The bigger sacrifices like the Aśvamedha and the Viśvajit were referred to occasionally with the word *mahat*: *tad aṅgam agryam maghavan mahākratoḥ*,⁷² *iti kṣitīṣo navatim navādhikām mahākratūnām.....tatāna*,⁷³ *ṛtvijaḥ sa tathā 'narca dakṣiṇābhīr mahākratau*,⁷⁴ *putro raghus tasya padam praśāsti mahākrator viśvajitaḥ prayuktā*.⁷⁵ Interestingly, the word *yāga* for sacrifice never figures in the works of Kālidāsa.

The words for sacrifice mostly have been used by the great poet as synonyms though in ritualistic texts they go with a particular sacrifice for which his use of a number of different words for the same sacrifice can be cited as proof, e.g., *homa*, *makha* and *kratu* for Aśvamedha, *yajña*, *adhvara* and *makha* for Viśvajit and so on.⁷⁶

It went with the rules of the sacrifice that the fee and the gifts were to be given at the conclusion of the sacrifice without which it was taken to be as good as futile: *hato yajñas tv adakṣiṇaḥ*. Kālidāsa mentions it first in the context of the coronation of Atithi, son of Kuśa and the grandson of Rāma so that Snātakas could complete their sacrifices with liberal gifts:

*sa tāvad abhiṣekānte snātakebhyo dadau vasu |
yāvataiṣām samāpyeran yajñāḥ paryāptadakṣiṇāḥ ||*⁷⁷

and the second time in the context of the performance of the Aśvamedha sacrifice by the same king:

*ṛtvijaḥ sa tathānarca dakṣiṇābhīr mahākratau |
yathā sādharmaṇībhūtam nāmāsyā dhanadasya ca ||*⁷⁸

Called Dīrghasatras some of the sacrifices would last very long. Patañjali in his *Mahābhāṣya* mentions them as going on for a hundred or even a thousand years: *vārṣasatikāni vārṣasāhasrikāni*. Kālidāsa for once makes a mention of the same in the context of the non-availability of the divine cow Surabhi (who had cursed Dilīpa) for her being in the nether region, Pātāla, for providing oblation, *havis*, for the Dīrghasatra of Pracetas:

*haviṣe dīrghasatrasya sā cedānīm pracetasah |
bhūjanāpīhitadvāram pātālam adhitiṣṭhati ||*⁷⁹

It is only once a while that the sacrificial instrument is referred to by Kālidāsa. There is mention of the *sruc*, the long sacrificial ladle, made of the *vikāṅkata* wood in the context of the disruption of Viśvāmitra's sacrifice. As the Ṛtvijs noticed the Vedi defiled with large drops of blood, they got so upset that the ladles dropped down from them:

*vīkṣya vedim atha raktabindubhir
bandhujīvaprthubhiḥ pradūṣitām |
sambhramo 'bhavad apodhakarmaṇām
ṛtvijām cyutavikāṅkatasrucām ||*⁸⁰

There is also mention of the sacrificial food, *caru*, which Daśaratha is said to have divided among his wives: *sa tejo vaiṣṇavaṃ patnyor vibheje carusaṃjñitam*⁸¹.

Oblation to sacred fire is of common enough occurrence in Kālidāsa. Among the many good things happening at the time of the birth of Raghu one is the household fire receiving oblation with the flame rightward:

*pradakṣiṇārcir havir agnir ādade*⁸²

The same thing happened at the lustration ceremony of the horses at the start of his victory expedition:

*tasmai samyag ghuto vahnir vājiniṛajanāvidhau |
pradakṣiṇārcir vyājena hasteneva jayaṃ dadau ||*⁸³

The augmentation of the natural splendour of fire with oblation is used by Kālidāsa in the context of the description of the sons of Daśaratha to compare the improvement (lit. increase) of their natural modesty by means of the method of education of discipline (which they underwent):

*svābhāvikaṃ vinītavaṃ teṣāṃ vinayakarmaṇām |
mumūrccha sahaṃ tejo haviṣeva havirbhujām ||*⁸⁴

The red Karṇikāra is compared by him to the fire blazing with oblations:

*hulahutāśanadīpti yuvatayaḥ kusumaṃ dadur āhitam
tadalake*⁸⁵

It is worth noting that quite a few times that Kālidāsa makes a mention of offering of oblations into the fire, he uses the word

*vidhinā*⁸⁶ or *yathāvidhi*⁸⁷ or *vidhivat*,⁸⁸ or *yathāvat*⁸⁹ or *samyak*⁹⁰ according to rule, in due order, with it. A sacrifice has to be performed according to rules or the procedure going with it as detailed in the relevant texts.

Kālidāsa belonged to a civilization when Vedic sacrifices were still in vogue, when altars were made and strewn around with the sacred Darbha grass, when the sacred fires, three or four, with each a specified place for it were lit, when an adequate stock of sacrificial firewood was maintained, when the priests, the Ṛtvijs, would help perform sacrifices for the Yajamānas or the Yājyas, when sages would pronounce blessings in Vedic metres and reveal the *mantras*, when kings and emperors would take pride in performing sacrifices, big and small, the daily ones and special ones requiring elaborate arrangements and would have on their completion the sacred *avabhṛtha* ablution. This was a civilization which has so much permeated the spirit of Kālidāsa that it has found spontaneous expression all through his immortal works.

REFERENCES

Note: The references and quotations in the article are from the text of Kālidāsa's works as given in the *Kālidāsaśaṅkharthāvalī*, edited by Rewa Prasad Dwivedi, Banaras Hindu University, Varanasi, 1976.

1. *Abhijñānaśākuntala* (*Abh.Ś.*), Act II, p. 456.
2. *ibid.*, Act, IV, p. 476.
3. *ibid.*, Act III, p. 459.
4. *ibid.*, Act IV, p. 486.
5. *Manusmṛti*, *ibid.*
6. *Manusmṛti*, II. 231.
7. *Raghuvamśa* (*Ragh.*), XIII. 37, p. 205.
8. *ibid.*, XV. 35, p. 222.
9. *ibid.*, V. 25, p. 136.
10. *ibid.*, XIII. 41, p. 205.

The observation of Pandit, as quoted by Nandargikar, on this is that 'this refers to what is called the *pañcāgnisādhana*, or a kind of mortification practised between four fires, one in front, one

behind and one on either side, and the summer sun shining on the head as the fifth'.

The Raghuvamśa of Kālidāsa, Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi, 1982, p. 881.

Though Manu at one place, II. 231, mentions the holy fires to be three, the Dakṣiṇa, the Gārhapatya and the Āhavanīya, at other places, III. 100, 185, he mentions them to be five, the two more being Sabhya and the Āvasathya. It is possible that Kālidāsa in his mention of four fires had in his mind one of the two, the Sabhya or Āvasathya in addition to the three referred to by the term Tretā.

11. *Abh. S.*, Act IV, p. 482.
12. *ibid.*, Act V, p. 498.
13. *Raghu.*, V. 25, p. 136.
14. *Meghadūta* (*Megha.*), Uttaramegha, verse 12.
15. *Abh.S.*, Act VII, p.556.
16. *Kumārasambhava*, (*Ku Sam.*), VI.72, p.81
17. *Raghu.*, XV.3., p.219
18. *Abh. S.*, Act III, p.475
19. *Raghu.*, XI. 1, p. 183.
20. *ibid.*, XI. 24, p. 185.
21. *ibid.*, XI. 30, p. 185.
22. *ibid.*, XV. 2, p. 219.
23. *ibid.*, XV. 3., p. 219.
24. *ibid.*, I. 6, p. 103.
25. *ibid.*, I.68, p. 108.
26. *ibid.*
27. *ibid.*, I. 62, p. 108.
28. *ibid.*, I. 61, p. 108.
29. *ibid.*
30. *ibid.*, I. 82, p. 110.
31. *ibid.*, II. 44, p. 115.
32. *ibid.*, VIII. 25, p. 159.
33. *ibid.*, XVIII. 12, p. 245.
34. *apūrṇam ekena śatakratūpamaḥ śataṁ kratūnām apavighnam āpa saḥ*, *ibid.*, III. 38, p. 122.
35. *ajasradīkṣāprayatas sa madguruḥ krator aśeṣeṇa phalena yujyatām*, *ibid.*, III. 65, p. 124.
36. *taṁ adhware viśvajiti kṣitīśaṁ niḥśeṣaviśrāṇitakośajātam*, *ibid.*, V. p. 134.

37. *ṛṣyaśṛṅgādayas tasya santah santānakāṅkṣiṇaḥ ārebhire jītmānaḥ putrīyām iṣṭim ṛtvijaḥ*, *ibid.*, X.4, p. 175.
38. *tam adhvarāya muktāśvam*, *ibid.*, X. 5, p. 175.
39. *vidher adhikasambhāras tataḥ pravavṛte makhaḥ*, *ibid.*, XV. 62, p. 224
40. *ibid.*, XI. 37, p. 186.
41. *ibid.*, XI. 32, p. 185.
42. *ibid.*, XIII. 3, p. 202.
43. *ibid.*, XVII. 76, p. 242.
44. *ibid.*, VI. 38, p. 145.
45. *ibid.*, XI. 37, p. 186.
46. *ibid.*, IX. 20, p. 167.
47. *jalāni sā ūranikhātayūpā*, *ibid.*, XIII. 61, p. 207.
48. *turaṅgamedhāvabhṛthāvatīrṇair ikṣvākubhiḥ puṇyatarīkṛtāni*, *ibid.*
49. *ibid.*, XVI. 35, p. 231.
50. *Ku. Sam.*, V. 73, p. 74.
51. *Megha*, Purvamegha, verse 45, p. 33.
52. *Raghu.*, XIII. 41, p. 205.
53. *ibid.*, XIII. 45, p. 206.
54. *bhuvam koṣnena kuṇḍodhnī medhyenāvabhṛthād api*, *ibid.*, I. 84, p. 110.
55. *ibid.*, IX. 22, p. 168.
56. *ibid.*, XI. 31, p. 185.
57. *ibid.*, XIII. 61, p. 207.
58. pp. 81, 556.
59. pp. 108, 23, 219
60. p. 144.
61. pp. 134, 183, 223, 231.
62. pp. 122, 124, 148, 186.
63. pp. 122, 135, 190, 224.
64. p. 175.
65. *Abh. S.*, Act III, p. 459.
66. *ibid.*, Act IV, p. 486.
67. *Raghu.*, II. 55, p. 116.
68. *ibid.*, III. 44, p. 122.
69. *ibid.*, XI. 30, p. 185.
70. *ibid.*, XI. 37, p. 186.
71. *ibid.*, XIX. 52, p. 253.

72. *ibid.*, III. 46, p. 122.
73. *ibid.*, III. 69, p. 124.
74. *ibid.*, XVII. 80, p. 243.
75. *ibid.*, VI. 76, p. 148.
76. *ibid.*, III. 38, 39, 45, pp. 122, IV. 86, p. 133, V.6, pp. 134, 135.
77. *ibid.*, XVII. 17, p. 237.
78. *ibid.*, XVII. 80, p. 243.
79. *ibid.*, I. 80, p. 109.
80. *ibid.*, XI. 25, p. 185.
81. *ibid.*, X. 54, p. 179.
82. *ibid.*, IV. 25, p. 128.
83. *ibid.*, IV. 25, p. 128.
84. *ibid.*, X. 79, p. 182.
85. *ibid.*, IX. 40, p. 169.
86. *yad agnau vidhinā hutam*, *Ku. Sam.*, VI.6, p.77.
87. *yathāvidhihutāgninām*, *Raghu.*, I.6, p. 103.
88. *haviṛ āvarjitaṁ hotas tvayā vidhivad agniṣu* (mark the plural indicative of the three fires), *ibid.*, I. 62, p. 108.
89. *tato yathāvad vihitādhvarāya*, *ibid.*, V. 19, p. 135.
90. *tasmai samyag ghuto vahniḥ*, *ibid.*, IV. 25, p. 128.

Kālidāsa's Ṛṣis

Whenever a writer writes something, consciously or unconsciously he weaves his thoughts into it. His work is in a way an extension of his personality. His creation, it reflects his mind.

Unlike modern writers Kālidāsa has said nothing about himself with the exception of a bare mention of his name in one of his dramas but in the course of his works he has left sufficient hints about his way of thinking, the working of his mind to help us sketch a picture of his personality, what he likes and dislikes, his preferences and priorities.

A study of his works reveals that the Ṛṣis occupy quite a substantial part of his thinking. As a matter of fact, the story of the best of his plays, the *Abhijñānaśākuntala* he has woven round Ṛṣis, one Ṛṣi who gives birth to Śakuntalā, another one who brings her up, still another one who pronounces a curse on her and the fourth one who affords her shelter after she is repudiated by her husband.

The position of Ṛṣis in Kālidāsa is that while some find a bare mention in his works in connection with some incident or the other, others find a detailed delineation or play a major role in his themes which runs through them to a considerable extent. In the first category too the Ṛṣis could be sub-divided into two, those who fell a victim to the charm of the nymphs and those who could resist it. To the first sub-division belong Ṛṣis like Viśvāmitra and Māṇḍakarni who were enticed by Menakā¹ and five nymphs² respectively. To the other belong Sutikṣṇa whom the blandishments of the nymphs were not able to corrupt³ as also

Tṛṇabindu who felt so bad with the nymph Hariṇī that he cursed her to be born a mortal female on the earth⁴.

Kālidāsa utilizes the opportunity of describing Rāma's return to Ayodhyā in the aerial car for referring to a number of Ṛṣis and their Āśramas as the car overflies them. Apart from the Ṛṣis referred to above, with the exception of Viśvāmitra, those who find mention in the description are Agastya, not referred to by name but by his unique actions of displacing Nahuṣa with a mere frown from the position of Indrahood and clearing turbid water⁵ and Śaraḥaṅga who made an oblation of his own body consecrated with Mantras into the holy fire having for long propitiated it with sacred fuel⁶.

The Ṛṣis in the second category, those who find detailed delineation or even if no detailed delineation, play a major role in his works can, on the basis of their temperament and behaviour, can be divided into two, those of the fierce type and those of the benign type. In the first category can be put Ṛṣis like Durvāsas and Paraśurāma and in the second, Ṛṣis like Kaṇva, Mārīca, Vālmīki and Vasiṣṭha.

Durvāsas who had earned the reputation of quickly flying into rage, *sulabhakopo maharṣiḥ*⁷, finds mention in Kālidāsan works at least twice, once, in the context of the pronouncement of the curse on the absent-minded Śakuntalā who could not notice his presence though properly announced: *ayam aham bhoḥ*⁸, the curse that changed the very course of her life and at another time in the context of Lakṣmaṇa on Rāma's door violating the condition for fear of the curse: *bhūto durvāsasaḥ śūpād rāmasandarśanārthinaḥ*,⁹ in that while Kāla in the guise of a Muni would be having secret discussions with Rāma anybody seeing them would have to be discarded.

Like Durvāsas Paraśurāma too is mentioned twice. First time in the context of his sudden appearance and challenge to Rāma, (being incensed at the latter's breaking of Śiva's bow at the Sītā-svayamvara) to put the string on his bow and to pull it¹⁰ which he did and sparing his life, he being a Brāhmaṇa, barred his way to the regions, *lokas*, earned by him through sacrifices saving for

him his movement, *gati*, at his request, he having been allowed to choose between the two.¹¹ The second time in the context of Rāma's command to Lakṣmaṇa to drop Sitā in the forest. Lakṣmaṇa had heard of Paraśurāma having dealt a blow to his mother as to a foe at the command of his father: *sa śuśruvān mātari bhārgaveṇa pitur niyogāt prahr̥taṁ dviṣadvat*¹². He agreed to do what his brother had asked him to. Killing by Paraśurāma of his mother by cutting off of her head is referred to at his sudden appearance before Rāma as mentioned above: *pituh śāsane sthitibhido 'pi tasthuṣā vepamānajanānīśiraśchidā*¹³. He is described as *roṣaparūṣātman*,¹⁴ stern in rage and unkind, merciless: *yena prāg ajīyata ghr̥ṇā tato mahi*¹⁵, who first subdued the feeling of kindness and then the earth.

Apart from being mentioned in the context of being enticed by Menakā, Viśvāmitra also finds mention in the context of asking Daśaratha for Rāma for warding off obstruction to his sacrifice¹⁶ on the conclusion of which he took him together with Lakṣmaṇa who had accompanied him from Ayodhyā to Mithilā on an invitation from Janaka to take part in a sacrifice. When the same was over, he conveyed to Janaka, Rāma's wish to see the bow. Feeling unsure of his capacity to handle it for his tender age, he could somehow persuade himself to do so by the confidence expressed in him by the sage which he fully justified by lifting the bow and putting the string on it. While taking Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa from Ayodhyā to his Āśrama the sage is said to have been telling them old tales, *pūrvavṛttakathitaiḥ*, he being well-versed in legendary lore: *purāvidah*.¹⁷

Of benign R̥ṣis out to help people in distress, we may first take up Kaṇva who picks up an infant Śakuntalā whom even her mother had forsaken, *ujjhitāyāḥ*, and brings her up and adopts her as his daughter: *śarīrasaṁvardhanādibhis tātakāśyapo 'syāḥ pitā*¹⁸, though unmarried, *śāśvate brahmaṇi sthitaḥ*. He looks to her well-being. Sensing that some evil is to befall her, he goes on a pilgrimage to Somatīrtha to mitigate it. When of age, he thinks of finding for her a suitable match: *anurūpavarapradāne saṅkalpaḥ*¹⁹, —*saṅkalpitam prathamam eva mayā tvadarthe bhartāram ātmasaḍr̥ṣam sukṛtair gatā tvam*²⁰

Overflowing with the milk of human kindness, he approves of Śakuntalā's choice made in his absence, without his knowledge and consent and sends her to her husband's home with all the blessings and words of advice. He feels her absence as any father would do. Though a recluse given to hard penance, *tapaścaraṇa-pīḍitam tātaśarīram*,²¹ he gives himself over to so much of emotion that it comes to stand in the way of his practice of austerities: Kāśyapaḥ—*Vatse uprudhyate tapo 'nuṣṭhānam*.²² He is a picture of kindness, gentleness and holiness, the picture that Kālidāsa draws with consummate skill.

It was Kālidāsa's penetrating vision which could bring forth a Ṛṣi when Śakuntalā was forsaken by her mother. It is that same vision which could bring forth another Ṛṣi, this time Mārīca, interestingly of the same *gotra* as Kaṇva: Duṣyantaḥ — *bhagavan! imām ājñākarīm vaḥ pratyādiśann aparāddho 'smi yuṣmatsa-gotrasya kaṇvasya*²³, when she was forsaken by her husband. He gave her shelter and brought up, as she was earlier by Kaṇva, her son whose rites also he performed²⁴ and solicitous of his well-being gave him a protective amulet, *rakṣākaraṇḍaka*, which when picked up by a person from the earth other than one's own self or parents would turn into a snake and bite.²⁵ It was in his Āśrama that Śakuntalā was united with her husband. It is he who gives the forecast about Duṣyanta's son that he is going to be a Cakravartin: *tathā bhāvinam enaṁ cakravartinam avagacchatu bhavān*²⁶, to be called Bharata by bringing about the welfare of his subjects, though called Sarvadamana in the Āśrama: *punar yāsyaty ākhyām bharata iti lokasya bharaṇāt*.²⁷

It is given to the Ṛṣis of Kālidāsa to give shelter and protection to the forsaken, the cast out. After Kaṇva and Mārīca comes Vālmīki. While her husband forsakes Sītā in an advanced stage of pregnancy in a dreary forest, it is Vālmīki who following her cries, *tadruditānusārī*,²⁸ comes to her and takes her to his Āśrama. So intensely does he feel for the hapless lady that he is resentful of Rāma for being unreasonable to her for no cause: *tvām praty akasmāt kaluṣappravṛttān asty eva manyur bharatāgraje me*²⁹. He acts as a father to her and asks her to feel

that she has come to her father's house with only a different location. That he was a father to her is acknowledged by Rāma as well when he speaks of Sītā as his (Vālmiki's) daughter-in-law: *tāta śuddhā śamakṣam naḥ snuṣā te jātavedasi*³⁰. With none to look to, it was Vālmiki who had come to Sītā's rescue. So complete was his owning of Sītā and the intensity of his desire that she should be rehabilitated that when Rāma offered him his kingdom³¹ on being told by Kuśa and Lava that the *Rāmāyaṇa* that they were singing and which had captivated his heart was composed by him (Vālmiki), he, the tender-hearted one, *kārunikaḥ*, asked for only the acceptance by him of Sītā: *kaviḥ kāruniko vavre sītāyāḥ saṁparigraham*.³² On Rāma promising that he would do so, on the condition that she should convince his subjects of the purity of her character, he has her brought from his Āśrama through his pupils much in the same way as he would his superhuman power, *siddhi* through the austerities: *śiṣyair ānāyayāmāsa svasiddhiṁ niyamair iva*³³, which is achieved through hard penance. To refer to Sītā as the very *siddhi* is the height of owning somebody. Of all the sages and seers of Kālidāsa it was given to only the two, Kaṇva and Vālmiki to so completely own those forsaken by mother and husband that one, Śakuntalā for the former becomes his very life breath, *bhṛgavataḥ kaṇvasya kulapater ucchvasitam*³⁴ and the other, Sītā, for the latter his very superhuman power, *siddhi*. Vālmiki also performs the sacraments according to Śāstraic rites of Sītā's sons, teaches them the Vedas with their subordinate subjects and makes them sing his own composition, the pathway first shown to the poets:

sañcaskārobhayaprītyā maitheleyau yathāvidhi |
sāṅgam ca vedam adhyāpya kiñcidukrāntaśaiśavau ||
*svakṛtiṁ gāpayāmāsa kaviprathamapaddhatim |*³⁵

The next one in the series of shelter-givers is Cyavana in whose Āśrama Urvaśī leaves her son secretly as a trust with Satyavatī, one of the female ascetics, as soon as born, on account of the compulsion of the curse that she would have to be back to heaven the moment she were to see his face: Urvaśī—*tato mayā mahārājavivogabhūrutayā jātāmātra eva vidyāgamanimitam*

*bhagavataś cyavanasyāśrama eṣa putraka āryāyāḥ satyavatyaḥ
haste aprakāśam nikṣiptaḥ.*³⁶

It is the sage who performs his birth rites: *jātakarmā-
dividhānam tad asya bhagavatā cyavanenāśeṣam anuṣṭhitam*,
teaches him and trains him in archery: *gr̥hitavidyaḥ dhanurvede
'abhivinītaḥ*³⁷.

Every Āśrama has its code of conduct. Anyone violating it has no place in it. Both Sarvadamana and Āyus being Kṣatriya lads had violated it in that they were found to have been oppressing the animals and birds in it. Theirs was the *āśramaviruddhavr̥tti*³⁸. They, therefore, had to leave their respective Āśramas. In the case of one, things were so arranged that the father took him away. In the case of the other, he was returned to his mother under the orders of the sage: *tata uplabdhavr̥ttāntena cyavanenāham samādiṣṭā niryātaya enam urvaśihaste nyāsam iti.*³⁹

The creatures in the Āśrama were looked upon as the very children of the hermits: *naḥ apatyanirviṣeṣāṇi sattvāni.*⁴⁰ Even if wild, they would get tamed by contact with the hermits: *tapasvisamsargavinītasattve tapovane*⁴¹ and were not to be killed. That is why the request of the hermits to Duṣyanta not to kill the Āśrama deer: *āśramamṛgo 'ayam na hantavyo na hantavyaḥ.*⁴²

It is meditation, *dhyāna*, that they practise. Through it the Ṛṣis come to have superhuman powers. The seers, they are able to see through the past, present and future with their eye of knowledge⁴³ which they come to acquire through *dhyāna*⁴⁴ or *pranīdhāna*. When Dilīpa approaches Vasiṣṭha and tells him of his issuelessness, he goes into meditation, for a moment: *kṣaṇamātram ṛṣis tasthau dhyānastimitalocanaḥ*⁴⁵ and then everything is clear to him: *so 'apaśyat pranīdhānena santateḥ stambhakāraṇam.*⁴⁶ The issuelessness is due to the curse that the divine cow had pronounced on him due to her non-circumambulation by him on his way to the earth.⁴⁷ The sad condition of Aja at the sudden loss of his wife also he comes to know while in his Āśrama through meditation: *pranīdhānād gurur*

*āśramasthitaḥ vijajñivān*⁴⁸. Vālmīki too comes to know through meditation: *jāne viṣṣṭām praṇidhānatas tvām mithyāpavādakṣubhitenā bhartrā*,⁴⁹ of the foresaking of Sītā by her husband disturbed by false slander. Mārīca too comes to know through meditation, when Menakā comes to his wife Dākṣāyaṇī with repudiated Śakuntalā that she has been refused by Duṣyanta on account of Durvāsas' curse which is to terminate at the sight of the ring;

*yadaivāpsarasatīrthāvataranāt pratyākhyānavai-
klavyām śakuntalām ādāya menakā dākṣāyaṇīm upa-
gatā dhyānād avagato 'smi durvāsasaḥ śāpād iyaṁ
tapasvinī sahadharmacāriṇī tvayā pratyādiṣṭā
nānyatheti, sa cāyam aṅgulīyakadarśanāvasānaḥ*⁵⁰

In the *Abhijñānaśākuntala* at the time of Śakuntalā's departure when the two sons of the R̥ṣis, the R̥ṣikumāras, go, on being asked by Kaṇva to gather for Śakuntalā flowers from trees something unusual happens. The trees bring forth to them the silken garment, the lac dye as also the ornaments which are the presents from sylvan deities through them for the departing lady.⁵¹ Due to his power even the trees are at the command of Kaṇva and render him service, the *sevā*, referred to by one of the R̥ṣis: *ehy ehi, abhiṣekottīrṇāya bhagavate kāśyapāya nivedayāva yāvad imām vanaspatisevām*⁵². When Duṣyanta enquires of the sages escorting Śakuntalā of the well-being of Kaṇva, their reply is that those possessed of the superhuman powers have their well-being under their control: *svādhīnakuśalāḥ siddhimantaḥ*.⁵³

Through their *siddhi*, the superhuman power, itself they can ward off any evil. In their presence the evil-minded demons can cause no obstruction to the sacrifices. The sons of the R̥ṣis while approaching Duṣyanta with the request to stay on in the Āśrama for a few days refer to the fact of the absence of Kulapati (Kaṇva) for the obstruction to their sacrifices: *tatrabhavataḥ kulapater asānnidhyād rakṣāṁsi na iṣṭivighnam utpādayanti*⁵⁴. Had Kaṇva been present, the demons, as is deducible from their remarks, would not have been able to do so and through his superhuman power itself he would have kept them at bay.

It was this superhuman power again which had enabled him to know what had happened to Śakuntalā and why. At the suggestion of Aditi after the union of Duṣyanta and Śakuntalā that Kaṇva be made acquainted with the accomplishment of the wishes of his daughter, Mārīca's comment is: *tapahprabhāvāt pratyakṣam sarvam eva tatrabhavataḥ*,⁵⁵ through the power of penance everything is present before the eyes of His Reverence, thus solving the mystery as to why Kaṇva whose very life-breath Śakuntalā was: *sā khalu bhagavataḥ kaṇvasya kulapater ucchvasitam*,⁵⁶ had not reacted at the most cruel treatment that Duṣyanta had meted out to her. This also comes as an explanation to Duṣyanta as to why the sage had not been very angry with him: *ataḥ khalu mama nātikruddho munīḥ*⁵⁷. Though realizing that Kaṇva is aware of everything, Mārīca agrees with Aditi's suggestion to convey the news to him and asks Gālava to go by the aerial path for the purpose: Gālava! *idānīm eva vihāyasā gatvā tatrabhavate kaṇvāya priyam āvedaya*⁵⁸. Going by the aerial path also is a proof positive of the superhuman power of the Ṛṣis.

The superhuman power is referred to in the *Raghuvamśa* as well. When Dilīpa goes to Vasiṣṭha's Āśrama and has to stay on there for sometime to render service to Nandinī, the latter makes arrangement for his stay that is suited to a forest life though having *tapasiddhi*, superhuman power, due to ripe asceticism (he could well have made other types of arrangements as well which could have been befitting his royal status):

*satyām api tapasiddhau niyamāpekṣayā munīḥ |
kalpavit kalpayāmāsa vanyām evāsya sarividhām ||*⁵⁹

The Ṛṣi was so powerful that his animals were safe from attack from any quarter. Nandinī refers to this when she calls out to the king expecting the swoop of the lion on him, to get up and the king does not find the lion. According to Nandinī on account of the power of the Ṛṣi even the god of death cannot strike her, much less other destructive animals: *ṛṣiprabhāvān mayi nāntako 'pi prabhuḥ prahartum kimutānyahimsrāḥ*⁶⁰.

Kālidāsa's study reveals that there were certain Ṛṣis who were associated with some royal families as their preceptors. As

Kulagurus they looked to their well-being. Whenever the kings were in difficulty, they repaired to them for help and assistance which they provided through advice and spiritual power. One such R̥ṣi was Vasiṣṭha. Dilīpa refers to what he means to him and his family. He is the averter for him of the divine and man-made calamities; *daivīnām mānuṣīnām ca pratihartā tvam āpadām*⁶¹. Through his *mantras* alone he would discomfit his enemies: *tava mantrakṛto mantrair dūrāt praśamitāribhiḥ*⁶². For the scions of the race of Ikṣvāku the achievement of anything difficult just depended on him: *ikṣvākūnām durāpe 'rthe tvadadhīnā hi siddhayaḥ*⁶³.

The efficacy of the *mantras* of Vasiṣṭha is referred to in the case of king Atithi, the son of Kuśa, too with the only difference that there is no mention of the futility of the arrows: *pratyādiśyanta iva me dṛṣṭalakṣyabhidaḥ śarāḥ*⁶⁴ referred to in the case of Dilīpa. There is reference, however, of the combination of the two, the *mantras* and the arrows which would accomplish just anything:

*vasiṣṭhasya guror mantrāḥ sāyakās tasya dhanvinaḥ |
kim tat sādhyam yad ubhaye sādhayeyur na saṅgatāḥ ||*⁶⁵

While in the case of Dilīpa he himself goes to Vasiṣṭha and places his problem before him, in the case of his grandson Aja it is Vasiṣṭha who sends one of his pupils with words of consolation to steady him while he was completely distraught at the sudden loss of his beloved wife to the point of losing all interest in life⁶⁶. Nobody had reported the condition of the king to the R̥ṣi. He had come to know, as stated earlier, of it while in his Āśrama through contemplation and thinking that as the family preceptor it was his duty to stabilize the king had sent his pupil, showing thereby as to how solicitous he could be as a family priest of the king and what kind of relationship subsisted between the two. So concerned was he at the disturbed condition of the king that he would have himself come along to him but for the fact he was tied up with a sacrifice which was still unfinished: *asamāptavidhir yato muniḥ*.⁶⁷

Since the Ṛṣis as preceptors were doing so much for the kings, it was but natural that they (the kings) should show them utmost respect. When they see Vasiṣṭha and Arundhatī, Dilīpa and Sudakṣiṇā fall at their feet: *tayor jagrhatuḥ pādān rājā rājñī ca māgadhi*⁶⁸. It is only after Vasiṣṭha had allowed him that he takes Nandinī's milk that she had offered him: *sa nandinīstanyam aninditātmā..... papau vasiṣṭhena kṛtābhyanuññah*⁶⁹.

It was not only to the family preceptors, the *Kulagurus*, alone to whom utmost respect was shown even by the mightiest of the mighty, it was shown to any Ṛṣi, even while he was not present. When the young sages like Śārṅgarava and Śāradvata in Kaṇva's Āśrama proceed to tell Duṣyanta of his message, the latter says: *kim ājñāpayati bhagavān*⁷⁰, what does His Reverence command? He always addresses Mārīca as *bhagavān*.⁷¹ Not only to a Ṛṣi, due respect would be shown even to his pupils. An emperor like Raghu would himself come out to receive a young graduate like Kautsa, the pupil of the sage Varatantu with an honorific offering⁷². When the young sages Śārṅgarava and Śāradvata approach Duṣyanta, he is found already to have left his seat and waiting for them: *Purohitaḥ—bho bhos tapasvinaḥ! asāv atrabhavān.....prāḡ eva muktāsano vaḥ pratipālayati*.⁷³ He also bows to them: *sarvān abhivādayate*⁷⁴. Earlier he asks the royal priest to introduce them to him after receiving them with Vedic rites while he would wait for them in a place proper for meeting the ascetics.⁷⁵

As the preceptors were exerting so much for the kings even to the extent of using their spiritual power for their well-being acquired by them after hard penance and austerities, they could not evidently put up with any kind of offence or dereliction on their part. They probably would have flared up at this which would have brought the chill down the spine of the kings for, anything could happen to them then. The lion in his advice to Dilīpa to desist from offering himself in exchange for the cow refers to this: *athaikadhenor aparādhacaṇḍād guroḥ kṛśānupratimād bibheṣi*⁷⁶, in case you dread the fire-like preceptor who with an only cow will be burning with anger at your offence.

While some of the R̥ṣis were family priests to the kings, the others were having friendly relations with them. Vālmiki, while addressing Sītā refers to his friendship with her father-in-law (Daśaratha): *tavorukīrtiḥ śvaśuraḥ sakhā me*⁷⁷ (which is an additional reason for him to be kind to her). The fact is referred to again in the context of the performance of the purificatory ceremonies of Lava and Kuśa where in addition to Daśaratha he is said to be a friend of Janaka as well: *sakhā daśarathasyāpi janakasya ca mantrakṛt*.⁷⁸ Viśvāmitra too is referred to as the friend of Daśaratha: *pūrvavṛttakathitaiḥ purāvidaḥ sānujaḥ pitṛsakhasya rāghavaḥ*⁷⁹. As it is, the word *sakhā* carries in it an element of intimacy.

The R̥ṣis seemed to have very long lives. In the *Raghuvamśa* there is mention for the first time of Vasiṣṭha in the context of Dilīpa. The last time that he is mentioned is in the context of Atithi, the son of Kuśa who is seventh in line from Dilīpa. It is interesting that the same R̥ṣi continues for seven generations!

As for the word R̥ṣi, it is variously used. Sometimes the same person is referred to as R̥ṣi at one place and Muni at another. The sons of R̥ṣis, the R̥ṣikumāras, coming to Duṣyanta with the request to stay in the Āśrama refer to Kaṇva as Maharṣi: *tatrābhavataḥ kaṇvasya maharṣer asānnidhyāt*.⁸⁰ At other places he is referred to as Muni, e.g. *anuyāsyān munitanayām*,⁸¹ *ataḥ khalu mama nātikruddho muniḥ*.⁸² It is not only the holiest of the holy like Kaṇva or Mārīca, who are referred to as R̥ṣis, even their young pupils are addressed so. Duṣyanta refers to them as such: *Vetravati! kim uddīśya bhagavatā kāśyapena matsakāśam ṛṣayaḥ preṣitāḥ syuh*,⁸³ for what purpose the revered Kāśyapa would have sent the R̥ṣis to him? Vetravati too calls them as such: *sucaritanandina ṛṣayo devaṁ sabhājayitum āgatā iti tarkayāmi*,⁸⁴ methinks, rejoicing at the good conduct of His Majesty the R̥ṣis have come to congratulate him; also *deva, prasannamukhavarṇā dr̥śyante, jānāmi visrabdhakāryā ṛṣayaḥ*,⁸⁵ the R̥ṣis have bright facial expression, methinks, they have come on peaceful errand. The royal priest presenting them to the king refers to them as *tapasyins — ete vidhivad arcitās tapasvinaḥ*,⁸⁶ here are the ascetics

given due honour. The king enquiring of them of the well-being of the inhabitants of the Āśrama refers to them as Munis: *api nirvighnatapaso munayaḥ*⁸⁷. That all the ascetics carried the appellation of Ṛṣis, is clear from their sons being referred to as Ṛṣikumāras or Ṛṣikumārakas.⁸⁸ That the words Ṛṣi and Muni were promiscuously used is also clear from the seven Ṛṣis sent by Śiva to Himālaya for begging the hand of his daughter for him. They are referred to at one place as Ṛṣis: *ṛṣīṇ jyotirmayān sapta sasmāra smaraśāsanāḥ*⁸⁹ and at another place as Munis: *gaganād avatīrṇā sā reje muniparamparā*.⁹⁰

The same also is clear from Viśvāmitra being referred to in the *Raghuvamśa* in the same context as Ṛṣi in some places: *dhanvinau tam ṛṣim anvagacchatām*,⁹¹ *netum aicchad ṛṣiḥ*,⁹² *tatra dīkṣitam ṛṣim rarakṣatuh*,⁹³ *pratyuvāca tam ṛṣir niśamyatām*⁹⁴ and Muni at others: *taṁ dideśa munaye salakṣmaṇam*,⁹⁵ *munes tau prapadya padavīm*,⁹⁶ *muneḥ prāpad aśramam*,⁹⁷ *āsasāda muniḥ śiṣyavargaparikalpitārhaṇam*,⁹⁸ *rāghavān vitam upasthitam munim*.⁹⁹

A further proof for this are the remarks of one of the two Ṛṣikumāras who came to the king with the request to stay in the Āśrama for a few days. The majestic figure of the king at the first sight so impresses him that he finds him in no way different from Ṛṣis: *upapannam etad ṛṣibhyo nātibhinne rājani*¹⁰⁰. Finding in him all that goes with a holy person he calls him in the subsequent remarks as *muni* with the only difference that the word *rājan* precedes it: *punyaḥ śabdo munir iti muhuḥ kevalam rājapūrvah*¹⁰¹. At a number of places Duṣyanta for his being a Kṣatriya is called *rājarṣi*. The same is the case with Viśvāmitra. The above analysis would lead us to conclude that according to Kālidāsa all the holy people in the Āśrama, the Tāpasas, could be alternatively designated as Ṛṣis, seers or Munis, sages, possessing as they did through the austerities that they practised the characteristics of both. The only difference between them and the seniors like Kaṇva, Mārīca, Viśvāmitra and so on was that the latter were almost always referred to with the honorifics like *bhagavān*, *tatrabhavān*. Further, they were not simply called *ṛṣis*, they were called *maharṣis*.

Some of the Ṛṣis like Vasiṣṭha, Mārīca and others were married and had wives like Arundhatī and Aditi, who were themselves highly revered for their spiritual attainments.¹⁰² While one, Arundhatī, sitting behind her husband is compared to Svāhā, the wife of Agni: *anvāsitam arundhatyā svāhayeva havirbhujam*, the other, Aditi, is spoken of as sharing the offerings in the sacrifices with her husband: *yajñabhāgeśvaram dvandvam dakṣamarīcisambhavam*. The householder's life came in no way in the performance of austerities of the Ṛṣis.¹⁰³ They had children, as should be clear from the frequent mention of the Ṛṣikumāras and engaged themselves in teaching, performing sacrifices and practising penance. Some other Ṛṣis like Kaṇva were total celebrities: *bhagavān śāśvate brahmaṇi sthita iti prakāśaḥ*¹⁰⁴. They looked upon the whole Āśrama as their family, though having no family of their own.

Three of the Ṛṣis are mentioned by Kālidāsa as Kulapatis: Kaṇva,¹⁰⁵ Vasiṣṭha¹⁰⁶ and Viśvāmitra.¹⁰⁷ A special designation, Kulapati is explained both by the *Padma-purāṇa* and some other Purāṇas quoted in the *Arthadyotanikā* commentary of Rāghavabhaṭṭa. According to the *Padma-purāṇa* a Kulapati is one who teaches a large number of pupils, is foremost among Munis and is occupied with *Vratas* and *Yajñas*:

*ācāryo bahūṣiṣyāṇām munīnām agranīs tu yaḥ |
vratayajñādikarmāḍhyaḥ sa vai kulapatiḥ smṛtaḥ*¹⁰⁸

According to the other *Purāṇa* quoted in the *Arthadyotanikā* Kulapati is that Brahmarṣi who teaches ten thousand Munis by providing them food, etc.:

*munīnām daśasāhasraṁ yo 'annadānādipoṣaṇāt |
adhyāpayati vipraṁśir asau kulapatiḥ smṛtaḥ*¹⁰⁹

Three of the Ṛṣis are mentioned by Kālidāsa to whom the *mantras* were revealed: Vasiṣṭha,¹¹⁰ Varatantu¹¹¹ and Vālmiki.¹¹² Of these Varatantu is spoken of as the foremost.

A lady and a young one at that, practising severe penance must have been rather unusual to excite the curiosity of the Ṛṣis who are said to have come to see her brushing aside all considerations of age:

*kṛtābhiṣekām hutajātavedasām tvaguttarāsāṅgavatīm
adhītinīm
didṛkṣavas tām ṛṣayo 'bhyupāgaman na dharmavṛddheṣu
vayaḥ samīkṣyate*||¹³

Whenever kings arranged big sacrifices, they invited Ṛṣis to them. Janaka invited Viśvāmitra to his sacrifice: *tām nyamantra-yata sambhṛtakratur maithilāḥ*¹⁴. Rāma invited to his sacrifice Maharṣis from several quarters: *digbhyo nimantritāś cainam abhijagmur maharṣayaḥ*¹⁵. They were shown great reverence¹⁶ and at the conclusion of the sacrifice were given a send off with gifts¹⁷.

Once in the works of Kālidāsa the Ṛṣis are shown on a different mission, viz., begging the hand of Pārvatī for Śiva from Himālaya. On this mission they are accompanied with Arundhatī who could be, as Śiva thought, particularly useful as an elderly lady for the purpose¹⁸. Aṅgiras served as their spokesman on the occasion.

Not all the Ṛṣis had their abode on the earth. Some had it on the stars. Invited by Rāma the Ṛṣis had come to him leaving not only their earthly abodes but also the starry ones:

na bhaumāny eva dhiṣṇyāni hitvā jyotirmayāny api||¹⁹

Since they had their abode on the stars, the seven Ṛṣis, are said to be of the luminous form: *ṛṣiṇ jyotirmayān sapta sasmāra smaraśāsanaḥ*²⁰. When they made their appearance before Śiva they are said to have illumined the sky with their halos:

te prabhāmaṇḍalair vyoma dyotayantas tapodhanāḥ||²¹

Some of the Ṛṣis were quite adept in handling arms along with practising penance and austerities. It was Cyavana who had trained Āyus, the son of Urvaśī in archery: *dhanurvede 'bhivinītaḥ*.²² It was from Viśvāmitra that Rāma had got the missile with its *mantra* which was capable of destroying demons: *nairṛtaghnam atha mantravan muneḥ prāpad astrap avadānatoṣitāt*²³. Paraśurāma carried both a rosary of beads in his right ear: *akṣabījavalayena nirbabhau dakṣiṇaśravaṇa-saṁsthītena yaḥ*²⁴ and also arms like the battle axe to which he

refers in the context of the possibility of Rāma feeling scared of it: *kātaro 'si tarjitaḥ paraśudhārāyā mama*¹²⁵ and the bow. It was the latter which he had placed before Rāma asking him with a view to testing his strength, to put the string on it and applying the arrow on it draw it: *tan madīyam idam āyudham jyayā saṅgamayya saśaram vikṛṣyatām*.¹²⁶ A great warrior, his missile had remained unimpeded even against the Krauñca mountain: *bibhrato 'stram acale 'py akunṭhitam*.¹²⁷

Even though recluses, leading a secluded life in a forest, the R̥ṣis were, conversant with worldly affairs. Kaṇva's statement: *vanaukaso 'pi santo laukikajñā vayam*¹²⁸ is fully corroborated by the advice that he, the bachelor one, gives to the young bride Śakuntalā as she is getting ready to leave for her husband's home which draws the remark from even the seasoned lady like Gautamī that was all the advice that could be given to a bride: *etāvān vadhūjanāyopdeśaḥ*¹²⁹. After going through it one comes to agree in full with Śārṅgarava's comment that there is nothing beyond the reach of the wise: *na khalu dhīmatām kaścid aviśayo nāma*,¹³⁰ the comment that he had offered on Kaṇva's statement as quoted above.

There is reference in the context of the R̥ṣis to the Vedas, the *R̥gveda* and the *Atharvaveda* in the works of Kālidāsa. The sage Vasiṣṭha is said to be the repository of the Ātharvaṇic lore: *atharvanidhiḥ*¹³¹. The sage Vālmiki coming to Rāma with Sītā and her two sons is said to be approaching the refulgent sun with R̥gvedic *mantra* (Sāvitrī) accompanied by proper intonation and purity:

*svarasaṁskāravatyāsau putrābhyām atha sītayāi
r̥cevodarciṣaṁ sūryaṁ rāmaṁ mūnir upasthitaḥ*||¹³²

While Śakuntalā is getting ready to leave for her husband's home, Kaṇva pronounces blessings on her in R̥gvedic metre *ṛkchandasā 'śāste*¹³³.

A couplet in the *Raghuvaṁśa* mentions the hermits returning from other forests being welcomed by the holy fires in invisible forms: *pūryamāṇam adṛśyāgnipratyudyātāis tapasvibhiḥ*¹³⁴. Mallinātha reproduces here two quotations which uphold the

poet's statement, one, *proṣyāgacchatām āhitāgninām agnayah pratyādhāvanti*, when those who keep fires return after being away, the holy fires receive them, two, *kāmaṃ pitaraṃ proṣitavantaṃ putraḥ pratyādhāvanti, evaṃ etam agnayah pratyādhāvanti*, just as sons run to the father returning from a visit from outside, so do the fires him (who keeps them).

Kālidāsa has the greatest respect for the holy people of whatever age group. If there be ascetics on the one hand and the king on the other, it is the king who has to bow to them. It is he who has to leave his seat. The request of the ascetics he has to take as command. The contribution of the ascetics is more valuable to him than even the heap of jewels. Their share to the State is their penance which is imperishable.¹³⁵ It is they who sustain it. At the back of the State power lies the spiritual power.

REFERENCES

Note: The references and the quotations in the article are from Kālidāsa's text as given in the *Kālidāsagranthāvalī*, edited by Rewa Prasad Dwivedi, Banaras Hindu University, Varanasi, 1976. The Act number from the dramas and the Canto number as also the verse number from the poems have been added to facilitate consultation from other editions.

1. Anusūyā – *asti ko 'pi kauśika iti gotranāmadheyo rājarṣiḥ | gautamīre purā kila tasya rājarṣer ugre tapasi vartamānasya kim api jātaśaṅkair devair menakā nāmāpsarāḥ preṣitā niyamavighnakāriṇī | tato vasantodāraramaṇīye samaye tasyā unmādayitṛ rūpaṃ prekṣya..... |*
Abhijñānaśākuntala (Abh. Ś.), Act I. p. 440
2. *purā sa darbhāṅkuramātravṛttiś caran mṛgaiḥ sārddham ṛṣir maghonā |*
samādhībhitena kilopnītaḥ pañcāpsaroyauvanakūṭabandham ||
Raghuvamśa (Raghu), XIII, 39, p. 205.
3. *asau tapasyaty aparas tapasvī nāmnā sutīkṣṇaś caritena dāntaḥ | nālaṃ vikartuṃ janitendraśaṅkaṃ surāṅganāvibhramaceṣṭitāni ||*
ibid., XIII. 41-42, p. 205.
4. *carataḥ kila duścaram tapas tṛṇabindoḥ pariśaṅkitaḥ purā | prajighāya samādhībhedinīm harir asmai harinīm sūrāṅganām ||*

*sa tapaḥpratibandhamanyunā pramukhāviṣkṛtacāruvibhramām |
āśapad bhava mānuṣīti tām,*

ibid., VIII, 79-80, p. 163.

The reference to Hariṇī occurs in the context of Indumati's sudden death from the accidental fall of a wreath from Nārada's Viṇā. Vasiṣṭha in his words of consolation to Aja recounts the incident to tell him of the actual position with his wife, who, being in reality a nymph turned into a human being through curse, had to go back to heaven. The inevitability of it he should accept and not grieve. The curse was limited by the sage to the sight of divine flowers.

ibid., XIII. 412, p. 205.

5. *bhrūbhedamātreṇa padān maghonaḥ prabhramśayām yo
nahuṣaṁ cakāra |
tasyāvilāmbhaḥpariśuddhihetor bhaumo muneḥ sthānaparigraho
'yam ||*

ibid., XIII. 36, p. 206.

6. *adaḥ śaraṇyaṁ śarabhaṅganāmnas tapovanam pāvanam
āhitagneḥ |
cirāya santarpya samidbhir agniṁ yo mantrapūtām tanum apy
ahauṣīt ||*

ibid., XIII. 45, p. 206.

7. *Abh. Ś.*, Act IV, p. 478.

8. *ibid.*, Act IV, p. 477.

9. *Raghu*. XV. 94, p. 227

10. *maithilasya dhanur anyapārthivais tvaṁ kilānamitapūrvam
akṣaṇoḥ |
tanniśanya bhavatā samarthaye vīryaśṛṅgam iva bhagnam
ātmanaḥ ||*

ibid., XI. 72, p. 189.

11. *na prahartum alam asmi nirdayaṁ vipra ity abhibhavaty api
tvayi |
śaṁsa kiṁ gatim anena patriṇā hanmi lokam uta te makhārjitam ||*

ibid., XI 84, p. 190.

12. *ibid.*, XIV. 46, p. 215.

13. *ibid.*, XI. 65, p. 188.

14. *ibid.*

15. *ibid.*

16. *kauṣikena sa kila kṣitūśvaro rāmam adhvaravighātāśāntaye |
kākapakṣadharam etya yācitas tejasām hi na vayah samīkṣyate ||*
ibid., XI. 1., p. 183.
17. ibid., XI. 10, p. 183.
18. *Abh.Ś.*, Act I., p.440.
19. ibid., p.441
20. ibid., Act IV, p. 488.
21. ibid., p. 493.
22. ibid., p. 492.
23. ibid., Act VIII, p. 557.
24. *Māricah – vatsa! kaccid abhinanditas tvayā vidhivad asmābhir
anuṣṭhitajātakarmādikriyaḥ putra eṣa śākuntaleyaḥ?*
Rājā – bhagavatā kṛtasamiskāre sarvam asminn āśāmahe ||
ibid., p.558.
25. ibid., p. 551.
26. ibid., p. 558.
27. ibid.
28. *Raghu.*, XIV. 70, p.217.
29. ibid., XIV. 73. p. 217.
30. ibid., XV. 72, p. 225.
31. *atha sāvrajo rāmaḥ prācetasam upeyivān |
ūrīkṛtyātmano dehaṁ rājyam asmai nyavedayat ||*
ibid., XV. 70, p.225.
32. ibid., XV. 71, p. 225.
33. ibid., XV. 74, p. 225.
34. *Abh.Ś.*, Act. III, p. 459.
35. *Raghu.*, XV. 31, 35, p.221.
36. *Vikramorvaṣīya (Vikr.)*, Act V. p. 418.
37. ibid., p. 414.
38. *Abh.Ś.*, Act VII, p.549.
39. *Vikra*, Act V, p. 415.
40. *Abh.Ś.*, Act VII, p.547.
41. *Raghu.*, XIV. 75, p. 217.
42. *Abb.Ś.*, Act I, p. 431.
43. *puruṣasya padeṣv ajanmanaḥ samatūtaṁ ca bhavac ca bhāvi.ca |
sa hi niṣpratighena cakṣuṣā tritayam jñānamayena paśyati ||*
Raghu., VIII, 78, p. 163.

Though said with reference to Vasiṣṭha it can apply to any Rṣi.

44. There is a picturesque description of the meditation practised by the R̥ṣis through the posture called Vīra, requiring as it does tremendous fortitude with its total stillness in the context of the mention of the penance grove of Atri by Rāma on the way from Lankā to Ayodhyā. It is said that even the trees standing in the middle of altars with their stillness for absence of wind appear to be practising Yoga:

*vīrāsanair dhyānajuṣām r̥ṣīṇām amī samadhyāsītavedimadhyāḥ |
nivātaniṣkampatayā vibhānti yogādhirūḍhā iva śākhino 'pi ||*

Raghu., XIII.52, p. 206.

45. *ibid.*, I.73, p. 109.

46. *ibid.*, I.74, p. 109.

47. *dharmalopabhayād rājñīm ṛtusnātām imām smaran |
pradakṣiṇakriyārḥāyām tasyam tvam sādhu nācaraḥ ||
avajānāsi mām yasmād atas te na bhaviṣyati |
matprasūtim anārādhya prajeti tvām śaśāpa sām ||*

ibid., I.76-77, p. 109

48. *ibid.*, VIII. 75, p. 163.

49. *ibid.*, XIV. 72, p. 217.

50. *Abh.Ś.*, Act VII, p. 557.

51. *kṣaumaṁ kenacid indupāṇḍu tarūṇā māṅgalyam āviṣkṛtaṁ
niṣṭhyūtaś caraṇopabhogasulabho lākṣārasaḥ kenacit |
anyebhyo vanadevatākaraṭalair āparvabhāgotthitair
dattāny ābharaṇāni tatkiśalayodbhedapratidvandvibhiḥ ||*

ibid., Act IV., p. 485.

52. *ibid.*

53. *ibid.*, Act V, p. 501.

54. *ibid.*, Act II, p. 456.

55. *ibid.*, Act VII, p. 559.

56. *ibid.*, Act III, p. 459.

57. *ibid.*, Act VII, p. 559.

58. *ibid.*

59. *Raghu.*, I.94, p. 111.

60. *ibid.*, II.62, p. 117.

61. *ibid.*, I.60, p. 108.

62. *ibid.*, I.61, p. 108.

63. *ibid.*, 72, p. 109.

64. *ibid.*, I. 61, p. 108.

65. *ibid.*, XVIII. 38, p. 239.

66. *abhiṣaṅgaḥ* *viśaṅgaḥ* *vijāñivān* *iti śiṣyeṇa kilānvabodhayat*, *ibid.*, VIII.75, p. 163.
67. *ibid.*, VIII. 76, p. 163.
68. *ibid.*, I. 57, p.107.
69. *ibid.*, II. 69.p. 118.
70. *Abh.Ś.*, Act V, p. 501.
71. *ibid.*, Act VII, p. 557, p. 557-8. When Mārica asks Duṣyanta to leave for his capital he says: *yad ājñāpayati bhagavān*.
72. *sa mṛṇmaye vītahiraṇmayatvāt pātre nidhāyārghyam anarghaśīlaḥ*
śrutaprakāśam yaśasā prakāśaḥ pratyujjagāmātithim ātithayaḥ||
Raghu., V.2, p. 134.
73. *Abh.Ś.*, Act V, p. 500.
74. *ibid.*, p., 501, footnote 5.
75. *Rājā – tena hi madvacanād vijñāpyatām upādhyāyaḥ somarātāḥ amūn āśramavāsinaḥ śrautena vidhinā satkṛtya svayam eva praveśayitum arhati iti* *aham apy atra tapasvidarśanocile pradeśe sthītaḥ pratipālāyāmi*||
Abh.Ś., Act V, p. 498
76. *Raghu.*, II.49, p. 116.
77. *ibid.*, XIV. 74, p. 217.
78. *ibid.*, XV. 31, p. 221.
79. *ibid.*, XI. 10, p. 183.
80. *Abh.Ś.*, Act II, p. 456.
81. *ibid.*, Act I, p. 442.
82. *ibid.*, Act VII, p. 559.
83. *ibid.*, Act V. p. 499.
84. *ibid.*
85. *ibid.*, Act V, p. 500.
86. *ibid.*, Act V, p. 501.
87. *ibid.*
88. *ibid.*, Act I, p. 455; Act IV, p. 485.
89. *Ku. Sam.*, VI.3, p. 76.
90. *ibid.*, VI.49, p. 80.
91. *Raghu.*, XI.5. p. 183.
92. *ibid.*, XI.6, p. 183.
93. *ibid.*, XI. 24, p. 185.
94. *ibid.*, XI.41, p.186.
95. *ibid.*, XI.2, p.183.

96. *ibid.*, XI.7, p.183.
 97. *ibid.*, XI.21, p.184.
 98. *ibid.*, XI.23, p.185.
 99. *ibid.*, XI.35, p.186.
 100. *Abh. Ś.*, Act 11, p. 455, p.186.
 101. *ibid.*
 102. *Raghu.*, 1.56., p. 107. Interestingly the word used for *Agni* here is *havirbhujah* which is just the right one to compare the R̥ṣi with. The couple born of Dakṣa and Marīci is said to be removed just one degree from the Creator: *dvandvaṃ dakṣamarīcisambhavam idaṃ tat śraṣṭur ekāntaram*, *Abh.Ś.*, Act VII, p. 556.
 As a devoted wife Dākṣāyaṇī wants to know from her husband the duties of the wives devoted to the husbands which he explains to her with the other wives of the R̥ṣis:
Mātali – aye vṛddhasākalya! kim anuṭiṣṭhati bhagavān mārīcaḥ? (ākarnya) kim bravīṣi?
dākṣāyaṇyā pativratādharmam adhikṛtya prṣṭas tasyai maharṣipatnīsahitāyai kathayaṭīti, *ibid.*, p. 546.
 Apart from the expression *maharṣipatnīsahitāyai*, accompanied with the wives of the Maharṣis, with reference to Dākṣāyaṇī above there is reference to the wives of the R̥ṣis in the *Raghuvamśa* in the description of the Āśrama of Vasiṣṭha who looked up on the deer as their offspring.
ākīrṇam ṛṣipatnīnām uṭajadvārarodhibhiḥ!
apatyair iva nīvārabhāgadheyocitair mrgaiḥ||
 103. The classic example in this case could be Mārīca whose hard penance is described by Mātali in the following stanza:
valmīkāgranimagnamūrtir urasā sandaṣṭasarpatvacā
kaṇṭhe jīrṇalatāpratānavalayenātyarthasampīditah!
aṅsavyāpi śakuntanīdanicitam bibhraj jaṭāmaṇḍalam
yatra sthānur ivācalo munir asāv abhyarkabimbam sthitah||
 “Immovable like the trunk of the tree, stands the yonder sage, facing the sun’s orb with his body half-buried in an anti-hill, with his breast closely covered over with sloughs of serpents, hard pressed at the throat with a ring of withered tendrils of creepers, and wearing a mass of matted hair overspreading his shoulders and closely filled with birds’ nests (Translation from M.R. Kale).
 Duṣyanta also calls the R̥ṣis as *kaṣṭatapas*, of hard penance: *namo*

104. *Abh.Ś.*, Act I. p. 440.

105. For Kaṇva:

1. Vaikhānaśaḥ – eṣa khalu kaṇvasya kulapater anumālinūtīram
āśramo dṛśyate!

Rājā – api sannihito 'tra kulapatih?

2. Rājā – api nāma kulapater iyaṁ asavarṇakṣetrasambhavā syāt?
ibid., Act I, pp. 432, 436.

106. For Vasiṣṭha:

nirdiṣṭāṁ kulpatinā sa parṇasālām!

Raghu., 1.95, p. III.

107. For Viśvāmitra: *ṛtvijaḥ kulapater yathākramam vāgyatasya
niravartayan kriyāḥ!*

ibid., XI. 30, p. 185.

108. *Abh.Ś.* ed. M.R. Kale. Gopal Narayan & Co., Bombay, 1920.

109. Ibid., p. 14.

110. For Vasiṣṭha: *tava mantrakṛto mantrair dūrāt praśamitāribhiḥ,*
Raghu., V. 4, p. 134.

111. For Varatantu:

*apy agraṇīr mantrakṛtām ṛṣiṇām kuśāgrabuddhiḥ kuśalī gurūḥ
te*

ibid., V. 4. p. 134.

112. For Vālmīki: *sakhā daśarathasyāpi janakasya ca mantrakṛt.*

ibid., XV. 31. p. 221

113. *Ku. Sam.*, V. 16, p. 70.

114. *Raghu.*, XI. 32, 185.

115. ibid., XV.59, p. 224.

116. Rāma is said to have given a send off to the Ṛṣis at the conclusion of his sacrifice where the gifts are said to have been the tears of the friends: *ṛṣiṇ viśṛjya yajñānte suhṛdaśrupuraskṛtān*

ibid., XV. 86, p. 226.

Nandargikar reads here *suhṛdaś ca puraskṛtān* in place of Rewa Prasad Dwivedi's *suhṛdaśrupuraskṛtān*, Whatever the reading, the Ṛṣis being *puraskṛta* honoured, with gifts at the conclusion of the sacrifice is evident from it.

117. Rāma's grandson Atithi at the conclusion of his sacrifice is said to have honoured priests with rich gifts:

ṛtvijaḥ sa tathā 'narca dakṣiṇābhir mahākṛatau!
yathā sādharmaṇībhūtaṁ nāmāsya dhanadasya ca||

Raghu. XVII. 80, p. 243.

118. *āryā 'py arūndhatī tatra vyāpāraṃ kartum arhati |
prāyeṇaivaṃvidhe kārye purandhrīṇāṃ pragalbhatā ||*
Ku. Sam., XI. 32, p. 78.
119. *Raghu.*, XV. 59, p. 225.
120. *Ku. Sam.*, VI.3, p. 76.
121. *ibid.*, VI. 4, p. 414.
122. *Vikr.*, Act V, p. 414.
123. *Raghu.*, XI.21, p. 184.
124. *ibid.*, XI.66, p. 188.
125. *ibid.*, XI.78, p. 189.
126. *ibid.*, XI.77, p. 189.
127. *ibid.*, XI.74, p. 189.
128. *Abh. Ś.*, Act IV, p.491.
129. *ibid.*
130. *ibid.*
131. *Raghu.*, I. 59, p. 108.
132. *ibid.*, XV. 76, p. 225.
133. *Abh.*, Ś. Act. IV, p. 486.
134. *Raghu.*, I.49, p. 107.
135. *Rājā – mūrkhā! anyam eva bhāgam ete tapasvino nirvapanti yo
ratnarāśīn api vihāyābhinandyate |
paśya.....
yad uttiṣṭhati varṇebhyo nrpāṇāṃ kṣayi tat phalam |
tapahṣadbhāgam akṣayyaṃ dadaty āranyakā hi naḥ ||*
Abh. Ś., Act II, p. 454.

Kālidāsa's Life-View

Introductory

A prolific writer, Kālidāsa has left sufficient indications in his works about his thinking on how life should be led. It is these indications which when pieced together give his view of life, to not as life is being led but as to how it should be led. This is his philosophy of life.

Even when he has dealt with old themes, he has put in their treatment sufficient originality to impart to them something of his own thinking. This, however, is not peculiar to Kālidāsa. Every writer does it. The difference is only in the degree and skill with which his own thinking, his own projections and perceptions on things, are woven into the texture of his works. The skill is required in that these should appear to be deducible covertly from the treatment of the theme rather than appearing overtly. The more consummate the skill, the less covert is the deduction. The less covert is the deduction, the more artistic is the creation.

The master writer, Kālidāsa has touched practically every aspect of human life in his works, also touching *inter alia* on its contact with the divine and the semi-divine.

Concept of Śāpa

One thing that emerges clearly from the study of Kālidāsa's works is that he always places duty above all other considerations.

That is the message of *śāpa*, curse, that he introduces in a number of his works. Śakuntalā invited it because she, being

engrossed, *ananyamānasā*, in the thoughts of Duṣyanta, did not notice the presence of the sage Durvāsas in the hermitage, *tapodhanam vetsy na mām upasthitam*¹, which was properly announced by him even though she had been assigned the duty of looking after the guests by her father before he had gone out; *idānīm eva duhitaram śakuntalām atithisatkārāya niyuja gataḥ*.² The Yakṣa invited it because of the neglect on his part of his duty, *svādhikārāt pramattaḥ*,³ which was to gather fresh flowers for his master Kubera with which he used to offer worship to Śiva. The Yakṣa once, instead of gathering them in the morning, had gathered them the previous evening not wanting to be away from his newly-wedded wife early morning, a fact revealed by Kubera's being stung by a bee coming out of a flower opened up at sun-rise having remained closed in it after the previous sunset. Dilīpa invited it by not circumambulating the divine cow, Surabhi, while returning from the heaven to the earth lost as he was in the thoughts of his wife, *ṛtusnātām imām smaran*, lest he should transgress Dharma, *dharmalopabhayāt*.⁴ The Gandharva Prince Priyamvada invited it through his conceit from sage Maṭaṅga who condemned him to elephanthood.⁵ The nymph Hariṇī invited it by causing obstacle to the hard penance of sage Tṛṇabindu who condemned her to be born a mortal female on the earth which she did in the form of Indumatī.⁶ Daśaratha invited it from the aged father of Śravaṇa, who condemned him to meet, like him, his death in the old age through grief for his son, *putraśoka*, by killing Śravaṇa by mistake.⁷ Rāvaṇa invited it from Nalakūbara, who announced that he would have his head broken into thousand pieces if he were ever to have a sexual act with an unwilling woman, by raping Rambhā who had gone to the latter for making love.⁸ Tāḍakā invited it from sage Agastya who condemned her to be an ugly-looking demoness, by attacking him.⁹ The moon invited it from Dakṣa, who condemned her to suffer from consumption by being excessively attached to only one of his daughters, Rohiṇī, to the exclusion of the others.¹⁰ Kāma invited it from Prajāpati by kindling lustful desire in him for his own daughter. Prajāpati later, (after he had controlled his

passion) condemned him to be burnt to ashes.¹¹ With his identity discovered, Agni in the form of pigeon invited it from Pārvatī on account of his audacity to enter into the privacy of her love sports with Śiva, though asked by the gods to do so.¹² Urvaśī invited it from Bharata, the first of the dramaturgists, because she, in the course of the performance of a play in Indra's court uttered, through a slip of tongue, the name of Vikrama in place of Puruṣottama.¹³

In all the instances, as mentioned above, it is the common element of some impropriety or the other which causes curse. Whether impropriety is deliberate or otherwise has little to do with punishment which one committing it has to undergo. Daśaratha had to undergo punishment though he did not mean to kill Śravaṇa. A crime is a crime, wanton or otherwise and can, as a consequence, never escape punishment. The common element of impropriety in situations as reproduced above can be broadly divided into three: One, where there is a lapse of some kind or the other on the part of someone, like the use of a wrong word, as in the case of Urvaśī, or causing obstruction to the penance of a sage as in the case of Hariṇī or raping an unwilling woman as in the case of Rāvaṇa, or kindling lustful desire for one's own daughter as in the case of Kāma or entering the strict privacy of the love-sports (of Śiva and Pārvatī) as in the case of Agni or just pride or arrogance as in the case of Priyamvada. The other, where there is dereliction of duty, the duty that should have been performed but was not performed as in the case of Śakuntalā or of the Yakṣa. The third, where there is conflict between duty and duty, one duty being taken to be more pressing than the other as in the case of Dilīpa. By not circumambulating the divine cow, Dilīpa did not permit himself dereliction out of just neglect or wantonness; he wanted to avoid committing an impropriety: *dharmalopabhayāt*. Even this extenuating factor did not help him in escaping punishment. Here was a conflict between duties, one towards a human being, his own wife and the other towards a divine being, the divine cow. Between the duty towards a human being and the duty towards a divine being, it is the duty towards

the divine being that must have precedence. Among different duties to be performed by a person, an order of priority has to be maintained. To ignore it is also dereliction deserving punishment.

Life is a tight rope walk for any individual. No emotional or sentimental considerations can extenuate his impropriety for which he has to suffer. That is the inexorable law of life. Even Agni, the divine being and the Yakṣa, the semi-divine being could not escape it. The Agni-episode has one more lesson. An impropriety committed by one's own self or in spite of one self under the impact of certain circumstances or an impropriety committed at the behest of some one and even with the best of motives makes no difference. Agni intruded into the privacy of the Primeval Couple, Śiva and Pārvatī interrupting their love-sports, at the behest of the gods; *abhyarthitaḥ śakramukhaiḥ suraiḥ*¹⁴, who wanted a son to be born to Pārvatī through Śiva, who could alone destroy the demon Tāraka. That did not help him from being cursed to be all-consuming, leperous, of terrible act and with smoke within:

*tvam sarvabhakṣo bhava bhīmakāyaḥ
kuṣṭhābhībhūto 'nala dhūmagarbhaḥ
ittham śaśāpādrisutā hutāśam
ruṣṭā ratānāndasukhasya bhaṅgāt*¹⁵ ||

It would have been unfair to punish only the being who was just carrying out somebody's orders. The prompters have also to get it. The gods also got it. They were not to have any issue from their wives.

Kālidāsa's view of life seems to have been the eternal principle: too much of every thing is bad. Unitrack approach he did not appreciate. To get engrossed in one thing only to the neglect of the other did not go well with him. Śakuntalā was *ananyamānasā*, Dilīpa's thinking was occupied solely with the thoughts of his wife, *smaran*. It was this which was bad. To think of the wife or the lover or the beloved, Kālidāsa, the poet of tender love, could not have objected. What he objected to was the sole preoccupation with it. A balance has to be struck in life.

Kālidāsa seems to believe in the principle of reformation. Nobody needs to be condemned for all time for his or her lapse,

more so when the lapse is not deliberate. In most cases he limits the curse to the unfolding of certain situations. He seems to believe that a limited period of punishment would chasten a person, purging him off his sins of omission and commission. A person so chastened and purged needs to be restored to his original form in such cases where it has been changed by way of punishment and to happiness. Thus Śakuntalā's curse he limited to the sight of an ornament of recognition, of Urvaśī to the sight of her son, of Dilīpa to the propitiation of Nandinī, of Hariṇī to the sight of celestial flowers, of Priyaṁvada to the piercing of the temple in his elephant-form by the scion of the race of Raghu.

In an odd case or two the *śāpa* is not limited to the development of certain situations. Its period is just limited. The curse in the case of the Yakṣa is limited to one year only; *śāpenāstaṅgamitamahimā varṣabhogyeṇa*¹⁶. Occasionally the *śāpa* is limited to physical violence. Priyaṁvada was to be shot at the temple in his elephant form by a scion of the Raghu's race to come back to his original form. Kabandha was to be killed by Rāma to be rescued from his grotesque form and to go to heaven:

*vadhanirdhūtaśāpasya kabandhasya.*¹⁷

That *śāpa* is punishment is beyond question but in certain cases it was not an unmixed blessing. Urvaśī was condemned to turn into a mortal and stay with a man she was passionately in love with. Hariṇī was born as Indumatī and got in Aja a husband whose devotion to her has few parallels. Daśaratha was cursed to die of *putraśoka*¹⁸, which did carry in it an ironical blessing in that till the time of inviting the curse he was issueless and was pining to have one:

*śāpo'py adṛṣṭatanayānanapadmaśobhe
sānugraho bhagavatā mayi pātito 'yaṁ*¹⁹

For Kālidāsa, of the three Puruṣārthas, Dharma is at the apex, the other two, Artha and Kāma, also leading to it and becoming one with it. That is the message of his line in the context of the description of Dilīpa:

*apy arthakāmau tasyāstām dharma eva manīṣinaḥ*²⁰

Yathā rāja tathā prajāh, as the king, so the subjects, being the well-known saying, the kings had to undergo greater rigour in their personal life to set an example to others. Not that every king was a paragon of virtues. The actual position vis-a-vis the ideal one, as enunciated by the poet in the context of enumeration of Dilīpa's qualities, would have been different as can be gleaned from the hot exchange between Śārṅgarava and Duṣyanta in the latter's court. Śārṅgarava bluntly points to the deceit and chicanery of the ruling elite of his time who grow with them, who learn them as an art: *parātisandhānam adhiyate ye vidyeti*.²¹

Kālidāsa was a believer in the set norms of the contemporary social life. Girls could choose husbands for themselves. Many of the girls had done so and the elders of the time had approved of their choice. So far it was in the open, it was all right. When it was done secretly, *rahaḥ*, particular care was necessary, *parīkṣya kartavyam*..... *saṅgatam*²² for the girls could be deceived by the unscrupulous, *ajñāta-hṛdayas*, and consequently had to suffer for the most of their lives. Kālidāsa seems to be giving expression to his own thinking on the subject through Śārṅgarava who terms such unions as *cāpala*, rash deed:

uttham ātmakṛtaṁ cāpalaṁ dahati.²³

Concept of Beauty

(a) Physical

Kālidāsa was a great lover of beauty, physical, material and spiritual. Nothing less than the superb would appeal to him. In his descriptions of things and events he would give free play to his imagination to conceive of as much of excellence as he possibly could. He seems to set norms for male and female beauty in his descriptions of Dilīpa, Raghu and the ruler of Avanti on the one hand and the Yakṣī on the other. Stronger of the two sexes, the male, has to look manly, his entire physique exuding it. Of all the males, the king being at the top should in all propriety, look the manliest of the manly. There are at least three places in the works of the great poet where manliness, the essential

characteristic of male handsomeness, is described picturesquely. The two out of these pertain to the father and son combine. The father, Dilīpa, is said to be *vyūḍhorasko vṛṣaskandhaḥ śālaprāṁśur mahābhujah*,²⁴ broad-chested, stout-shouldered, tall as the Śāla tree and massive-armed. The son, Raghu, is said to be *yuvā yugavyāyatabāhur aṁsalaḥ kapāṭavakṣāḥ pariṇaddha-kaṇḍharaḥ*,²⁵ 'young with arms as long as the yoke of a car, chest as broad as a folding door, and a neck well-turned'. While nothing is said openly, the descriptions do leave traces of the fine distinction between the handsomeness of the old male and the young male, both of them being the model of the same no doubt. While the old one with strong chest is *vyūḍhoraskaḥ*, broad-chested, the young one is *kapāṭavakṣāḥ*, with a door-like chest; while the old one is *mahābhujah*, with long arms, the young one is *yugavyāyatabāhuḥ*, with arms stretched out like a yoke; while the old one is *vṛṣaskandhaḥ*, with shoulders like those of the humps of bulls, the young one is *aṁsalaḥ*, with well-knit shoulders. About tallness there is no mention in the case of the young one. The old one alone is described as *śālaprāṁśuḥ*, as tall as the Śāla tree. The total impact left by the two, even according to Kālidāsa, is that the young one is more majestic in figure than the old one, *vapuḥprakarṣād ajayad gurum raghuḥ*.²⁶ The third place where male handsomeness is described pertains to the ruler of Avanti on the occasion of the Svayamvara of Indumatī. The description is: *avantinātho 'yam udagrabāhur viśālavakṣās tanuvṛttamadhyah*,²⁷ 'this is the ruler of Avanti, with long arms, broad chest and slender, round waist'. The addition here, in respect of the two earlier descriptions, is with regard to the waist while there is no reference to height and shoulders. His handsomeness is said to be like that of the sun trimmed off with care by Tvaṣṭṛ by placing it on his round lathe: *āropya cakrabhramam uṣṇatejās tvaṣṭreva yatnollikhito vibhāti*.²⁸

In all the above cases Kālidāsa has uniformly ascribed certain qualities like long arms and broad chest to every one of the three, while certain other qualities like the excessive height, well-turned neck and slender, well-rounded waist only to specific rulers. Interestingly, even in description of common qualities he has used

each time different words which may bring to the fore highly artistically the fine distinction even among them. Dilīpa is *mahābhujah*, Raghu is *yugavyāyatabāhuḥ*, the ruler of Avanti is *udagrabāhuḥ*. Dilīpa is *vyūḍhoraskah*, Raghu is *kapāṭavakṣāḥ*, the ruler of Avanti is *viśālavakṣāḥ*. Dilīpa is *vṛṣaskandhaḥ*, Raghu is *aṁsalaḥ*.

The female beauty as mentioned in the *Meghadūta* in the context of the Yakṣī, makes her, in the words of the poet himself, the best of the creations of the creator: *yā tatra syād yuvativīṣaye sṛṣṭir ādyeva dhātuh*.²⁹ The Yakṣī was slender-framed, youthful, with pointed teeth with the lower lip resembling a ripe *bimba* fruit, thin in the middle, with eyes like those of a frightened deer, deep navel and gait, slow with the weight of her hips, slightly stooping on account of her breasts.

(b) Material

As for the material beauty, the best expression of it is found in the description of the city of Alakā and there too in the palace of the Yakṣa which, as the work says, is noticeable from a distance with its main gate of rainbow-like charm. Inside it are the red Aśoka and the Kesara trees adjoining the hedge of Kuravakas with Mādhavī creepers forming a canopy over it. Near them is a pleasure hillock of sapphire lined by golden plantain trees. It has tank with its flight of steps of emeralds, covered as it is all over by blooming golden lotuses with their stalks of lapis lazuli. Close to it is a resting place of gold topped by a crystal slab with its stand studded at the bottom by gems of the colour of bamboo of not excessive glow. On it in the evening a peacock, the pet of the Yakṣī, would appear and would dance to the accompaniment of marking of time by her³⁰. The description is unmatched in Sanskrit literature for its grand vision of the costliest of the jewels and stones. Kālidāsa loves grandeur.

Spiritualism and Materialism: Their togetherness

In Kālidāsa's vision renunciation and acquisition go together. On the one hand he describes the hermitages of Kanya, Mārica

and Vālmīki, on the other the most prosperous of the cities of Alakā and Ujjayinī with the high rise buildings of the one and the costliest of the merchandise, the heaps of pearls and jewels of the other. Life according to Kālidāsa had to be lived in its fulness. Spiritualism is in no case to be divorced from materialism. The only care that needed to be exercised was that greater consideration was to be shown to spiritualism, which was taken to be the mainstay of society. The greatest of the kings, the allies of even Indra in battles like Duṣyanta would have to cast off their regal outfit for putting on an humble appearance to enter a penance grove: *vinītaveṣeṇa praveṣṭavyāni tapovanāni nāma*.³¹ No taxes were due from the hermits, one sixth of their penance itself being taken to be, like the one sixth of the produce from the producers or earnings from merchants and traders, as the revenue to the State with this difference that it was imperishable and non-depletable: *tapahṣaḍbhāgam akṣayyam dadaty āraṇyakā hi naḥ*.³² According to Kālidāsa the contribution of sages and hermits to the upkeep of the State is far greater than other segments of society. The State authority, he believes, has to have a spiritual base to sustain itself. A combination of the two is, what leads to the growth of both: *pavanāgnisamāgamahy ayaṁ sahitam brahma yad astratejasā*.³³ This *samāgama* is also required for conserving the spiritual power attained with hard penance. *Śāpa*, curse, the one means with the holy for protection and for warding off obstructions and obstacles is to be used, leading as it does to the frittering away of the hard-earned merit, very sparingly: *trāṇābhāve hi śāpāstrāḥ kurvanti tapaso vyayam*.³⁴ It is for the State authority to look to their well-being.

Importance of Education

Kālidāsa seems to attach great importance to education. Even an emperor like Raghu goes out to meet a young graduate, Kautsa, who has just finished his education and who approaches him for *dakṣiṇā* to his teacher with an honorific offering, *arghya*.³⁵ Duṣyanta is equally respectful to young sage lads, Śāringarava and Śāradvata.³⁶

Dual Forces in Life: Good and Bad

Kālidāsa believes that in the life of an individual there are two kinds of forces operating at one and the same time, one trying to create difficulties for him, bringing unhappiness and misery to him and the other trying to help him through them. One represents the *nigrahadhārā* and the other the *anugrahadhārā*. This can best be seen in the life of Śakuntalā. The very circumstances of the birth of the hapless lady were unfortunate. The mother deserted her as soon as she delivered her. Kaṇva, the sage, took pity on her and brought her up. Foreseeing that bad luck was to befall her, he took pilgrimage to Somatīrtha to avert it: *daivam asyāḥ pratikūlam śamayitum somatīrtham gataḥ*.³⁷ After she had been repudiated by Duṣyanta, her mother deposited her in the hermitage of the sage Mārīca in the higher regions where she gave birth to a son, Bharata, whose birth rites, etc., were all performed by the sage who also bestowed on him the protective amulet, the *rakṣākaraṇḍaka*, which when touched by some one other than the father and mother would turn into a serpent and bite him/her:

Prathamā : *eṣāparājītā nāmauśadhir asya jātakarmasamaye
bhagavatā Mārīcena dattā. etām kila mātāpitarāv
ātmānam ca varjayitvā'paro bhūmipatitām na
grhṇāti*

Rājā : *atha grhṇāti?*

Prathamā : *taṭas tam sarpo bhutvā daśati*.³⁸

The sages Kaṇva and Mārīca represent for Śakuntalā the *anugrahadhārā*. So do her friends Priyamvadā and Anasūyā who beseech the fiery sage Durvāsas for pardon which makes him relent to the extent of limiting the curse to the sight of an ornament of identification: *abhijñānābharaṇadarśanena śāpo nivartiṣyate*.³⁹ Menakā who forsakes her after birth and Durvāsas who curses her to be forgotten by Duṣyanta represent the *nigrahadhārā*. Incidentally, the story of the *Abhijñānaśākuntala* seems to have been woven by the master playwright around four seers, one who gives birth to Śakuntalā, the other who brings her

up, the third who curses her to be forgotten by her husband and the fourth who gives her shelter after her repudiation by him and in whose Āśrama she gets united with him. The same *nigrahadhārā* and the *anugrahadhārā* are found in the life of Sītā as well. While she is left in the dreary forest by Lakṣmaṇa under the orders of Rāma; it is the sage Vālmīki who following her cries, *tadruditānusārī*,⁴⁰ takes her to his hermitage inviting her to live there. If there is cruelty on one hand, there is pity on the other. This is how Kālidāsa views life where there is no unmitigated sorrow or unhappiness.

Concept of Love

All along Kālidāsa has been accepted as a poet of tender love. That he is no doubt. But his love is to be purged of passion to make it enduring. It is not mere mythology that Kāma out to generate passion in Śiva was burnt to ashes. This does not mean that love in Śiva dies. Simply Pārvatī has to divert it to her by hard penance. The unique love blooms forth then, *kva tādṛśaṁ prema*.⁴¹ Śakuntalā has also to purge herself of it by undergoing great mental and emotional shock and a life of great hardship: *niyamakṣāmamukhī dhṛtaikaveṇī*⁴². When she is united with Duṣyanta she had passed through a period of terrible stress and strain and was no longer the young impulsive maiden falling headlong for a stranger, addressing love letters to him. A sober lady with a poise and dignity she was just ripe for the kind of love that does not steam off with years.

Hold of Tradition

Kālidāsa's whole outlook on life is governed by tradition which seems to exercise its firm hold on him. Though protesting initially at the unjust and cruel behaviour of the husbands towards their wives, he resigns himself to ascribing everything to fate and making the women, true to Indian tradition, exonerate husbands of their misdemeanour. In the *Raghuvamśa* when Lakṣmaṇa delivered the cruelest of the cruel of orders of Rāma that he had forsaken her, Sītā though completely taken unawares and stung

deep, did not find fault with him (Rāma) but condemned only her own unfortunate self again and again:

*na cāvadaḍ bhartur avarṇam āryā
nirākariṣṇor vṛjinād ṛte'pi
ātmānam eva sthiraduḥkhabhājan
punaḥ punar duṣkṛtinam nininda* 43

The only time there was a streak of protest in her was when she asked Lakṣmaṇa after regaining herself: *vācyaṣ tvayā madvacanāt sa rājā*⁴⁴. You tell that king in my name that is it befitting for his family that he forsook her, purified in fire before his very eyes. The expression *sa rājā*, that king, for the husband, reveals more bitinglly than anything else, Sītā's writhing pain at his being a king only and not a husband; a king who, to avoid public censure and to implant firmly morality among his subjects by his precept, has forsaken his pregnant wife not caring for the fact that her purity had been tested in fire before his very eyes. This mood, interestingly, persists only for a moment. The next moment she relapses into her old self and holds the misdeeds of her previous births responsible for the unfortunate development, *mamaiva janmāntarapātakānām vipākavisphūrjathur aprasahya*⁴⁵. With all that was done to her, she prays that she should have the same husband even in the next birth and that there be no separation: *jananāntare'pi tvam eva bhartā na ca viprayoga*⁴⁶. Kālidāsa's faith in the self-abnegating and self-effacing nature of Indian womanhood, nurtured all through, is too deep-rooted to be shaken under any circumstances. This is noticeable in his treatment of Śakuntalā and Dhārinī as well. The former, repudiated by husband and dealt with the cruelest of the blows has only her fate to blame: *sā nindantī svāni bhāgyāni bālā*⁴⁷. In the last Act of the *Abhijñānaśākuntala* when Bharata enquires of her as to who the unknown man, Duṣyanta is, her cryptic remark is, *vatsa te bhāgadheyāni pṛccha*⁴⁸, my child, ask your fate. To Duṣyanta her remark is *nūnam me sucaritapratibandhakam purākṛtam teṣu divaseṣu pariṇāmābhimukham āsīd yena sānukroṣo'py āryaputro mayi virasaḥ saṁvṛtā*⁴⁹, certainly an (evil) deed done by me in a past life obstructing (the action of my) virtue (merit) was in

those days about to bear fruit by which my Lord, although compassionate by nature, became heartless towards me. As for Dhārīṇī, she would not like Agnimitra to go in for another woman. She rebukes him in pungent satirical words when she notices him attracted towards Mālavikā in a dance scene: *yadi rājakāryeṣv apīdṛśy upāyanipuṇatā'ryaputrasya tataḥ śobhanam bhavet*,⁵⁰ 'such efficiency would be good, if shown in the affairs of the State'. She persuades herself ultimately when all her efforts fail to checkmate intimacy developing between her husband and the young damsel Mālavikā, to arrange for the union of the two entailing tremendous sacrifice on her part leading Parivrājikā Kauśikī to observe that the noble women attached to their husbands serve them even if it be against their desires: *pratipakṣeṇāpi patim sevante bhartrvatsalāḥ sādhyāḥ*.⁵¹

As is Dhārīṇī of the *Mālavikāgnimitra* so is Auśīnarī of the *Vikramorvaśīya*. She is upset, understandably, on coming to know of the secret love affair of her husband with Urvaśī first through a maid and later through the love letter of Urvaśī on a birchbark that is per chance flown to her by wind with which she approaches him (her husband) while the search for it is on. The husband apologizes to her by touching her feet and by saying that he is of course guilty, be pleased, *aparādhī nāmāham prasīda*⁵², which, however, fails to assuage her feelings to which she gives expression in the words, *nāsti bhavato'parādhah. aham evātrāparāddhā yā pratikūladarśanā bhūtvā agratas te tiṣṭhāmi*⁵³, 'there is no fault on your part. Here I alone am at fault in that I, the unwanted, stand before you'. She goes out not caring outwardly for the husband trying to bring her round though afraid inwardly of the penitence: *mā khalu laghuhrdayā'ham anumayam bahu manye kintu dākṣiṇyakṛtāt paścāttāpād bibhemi*⁵⁴. Later this feeling of penitence overpowers her and she observes the vow of placating the loved one, *priyānuprasādana*, at which she, the Pativrata, that is how she is called by Citralekhā, the friend of Urvaśī announces her decision: *adyaprabhṛti yām striyam āryaputraḥ prārthayate yā vāryaputrasya samāgamapraṇayinī tayā mayā prītibandhena vartitavyam*⁵⁵. 'From today onwards I

shall be bound in love to any woman whom my husband loves or who longs for my husband's company'. She wants to see that her husband is happy even at the cost of her own happiness: *aham khalv ātmanaḥ sukhāvasānena āryaputram nirvṛtaśarīram kartum icchāmi*⁵⁶.

The faithful Indian women would always look to the desires of their husbands, not even once permitting themselves any action otherwise: *bhavanty avyabhicāriṇyo bhartur iṣṭe pativratāḥ*.⁵⁷ That is indeed what traditional Indian womanhood is and it is this which Kālidāsa has portrayed. She always had stood for the happiness of the husband not caring for that of her own.

Belief in Fate

A careful perusal of the works of Kālidāsa shows his strong belief in fate. There is so frequent a mention of it in his works and so many incidents are ascribed to its working that it is impossible to conceive of him not believing in its all-powerful role. *Bhavitavyatā, bhāgya, bhāgadheya, vidhi, daiva, niyati, kṛtānta* are some of the words by which he designates it. In the *Vikramorvaśīya* when one of Bharata's pupils says that during a performance Urvaśī in the role of Lakṣmī on being asked as to whom among Keśava and the Lokapālas she is attached, she, through slip of tongue utters the word Purūravas instead of Puruṣottama (Keśava), the other pupil remarks: *bhavitavyānuvidhāyīndriyāṇi*,⁵⁸ 'the senses proceed according to what is destined'. There is reference to fate again in the same play under the different word *daiva* in the context of the king's union with his son and his imminent separation from Urvaśī: *aho sukhapratyarthitā daivasya*⁵⁹; 'Oh! the opposition of fate to happiness' (due to the condition imposed by Indra on the latter having been cursed by Bharata for her slip of tongue in pronouncing the word Purūravas in place of Puruṣottama that she could be with Purūravas only till she sees her son's face).

In the *Mālavikāgnimitra* Irāvati, the queen of Agnimitra is seen to be cross with him to find him with Mālavikā. She leaves in a huff in disregard of his entreaties. She softens later and comes

to meet him to find the same scene back again. To notice her feelings ruffled the jester tells her that the king had forgotten the impropriety of ignoring his efforts to placate her but that does not reconcile her. The king also tells her that her anger is improper which does not befit her. With a pungent irony Irāvati remarks that the king has rightly said 'improper'. She refers to the king's love for her as her luck and says that with that transferred to some one else, if she were to feel angry, she would look ridiculous; *anyasaṅkrānteṣv asmākaṁ bhāgadheyeṣu yadi punaḥ kupyeyam tato hāsyā bhaveyam*.⁶⁰

Fate is referred to again in the work in the context of the blossoming of the Aśoka tree with the stroke of Mālavikā's foot. Its female garden-keeper mentions this with the feeling that the event would please the Chief Queen who through jealousy had otherwise been very hard to her: *aho daivasyānukampanīyā mālavikā*; 'Oh, Fate has taken pity on Mālavikā'.⁶¹ Fate still again is an object of reference in the work when at the query of the king on learning from the two artist maids sent as present from the Vidarbha country that Mālavikā is the younger sister of Prince Mādhavasena who had been released from confinement after defeating the Vidarbha ruler, as to how she had come to such a pass; *athātrabhavaṭi katham itthambhūtā*?⁶²; she says to herself (*ātmagatam*) *vidhiniyogena*⁶³, through a play of fate. Kauśiki's referring to herself as *mandabhāgyā*⁶⁴, unfortunate, also underlines the play of fate in the shaping of events, which she proceeds to narrate from where the maids had finished; *ataḥ param ahaṁ mandabhāgyā kathayiṣyāmi*.

In the *Abhijñānaśākuntala* fate is referred to a number of times. There is reference to it in the very beginning of the work itself. When Duṣyanta in pursuit of a deer in a forest enters a hermitage, he notices the throbbing in the arms, an indication of something good coming which he is not able to make out that time. He then says:

śāntam idam āśramapadam sphurati ca bāhuḥ kutah phalam ihāsyai

there are openings everywhere for what are predestined. Fate is referred to again when a hermit informs Duṣyanta at the latter's query whether Kaṇva is in the hermitage that he (Kaṇva) has gone to Somatīrtha for appeasing the adverse fate of Śakuntalā entrusting her with the duty of honouring guests; *Śakuntalām atithisatkārāya niyujya daivam asyāḥ pratikulam śamayitum somatīrtham gataḥ*.⁶⁶ Kaṇva while delivering a message for Duṣyanta at Śakuntalā's departure for his capital also refers to it. He tells him to treat her the same way as he treats his other wives keeping him in mind as also his noble lineage and his love for her. He need not add anything more to it, says he (Kaṇva) for, beyond this everything depends upon fate: *bhāgyāyattam ataḥ param*,⁶⁷ meaning thereby that it is fate alone which is to determine how, in spite of all this, things are to turn out. The next time fate is referred to is when Śakuntalā having been repudiated by Duṣyanta finds fault with it: *sā nindantī svāni bhāgyāni bālā*.⁶⁸

The nymph Sānumatī keeping an invisible watch over the actions of Duṣyanta makes a reference to it when she hears remorseful Duṣyanta say after the discovery of the ring that his heart which remained asleep even after it was being awakened by Śakuntalā was now broad awake to suffer the agony of remorse, *nanv īdrśāni tapasvinyā bhāgadheyāni*⁶⁹, such is the lot of the poor (creature). Fate is referred to again when in the jasmine grove, Mādhavimaṇḍapa, at the king's query to the jester as to whether he, like him, too had forgotten about Śakuntalā not having mentioned her name any time, the jester replies: far from it. After telling him everything about his affair with her, he (the king) had told him finally that it was only a joke and not a fact and that he, the dullard (*mṛtpiṇḍabuddhi*), had taken it as such. As a postscript to the above the jester adds: *athavā bhavitavyatā khalv atra balavati*⁷⁰; 'or what is destined is indeed here inexorable'. As the jester and the king continue, the former asks the latter as to what for he had placed the ring in Śakuntalā's hand, the latter says that he had done so at the time of his departure from the hermitage for his capital to tell her to count the days as per the number of syllables in the name inscribed on

it. By the time she would come upon the last of it, a person would appear to escort her to his harem which out of infatuation he did not do. The nymph Sānumatī listening invisibly to the above refers to fate and ascribes to it the frustration of the aforesaid arrangement: *ramaṇīyaḥ khalv avadhir vidhinā visamvāditaḥ*.⁷¹

The next reference to fate is when Śakuntalā talking to herself in Mārīca's Āsrama after hearing the news of the herb retaining its natural form and not undergoing a metamorphosis (which it would if touched by one other than parents and one's own self) even after being lifted up by Duṣyanta, says: *vikārakāle 'pi prakṛtisthām sarvadamanyāuśadhiṁ śrutvā na ma āsā 'sīd ātmano bhāgadheyeṣu*⁷², "even though I heard that Sarvadamana's herb remained in its natural form even at the time of metamorphosis, I had no hope about my fortune. She further refers to it when she most unexpectedly, comes face to face with Duṣyanta; *parityaktamatsarenānukampitāsmi daivena*,⁷³ 'the fate has shown mercy to me'. Fate is referred to next when at Bharata's query to Śakuntalā as to who the stranger—he does not know that he is his father Duṣyanta who had earlier lifted him up and is now engaged in conversation with his mother—is, Śakuntalā says; *vatsa te bhāgadheyāni prccha*,⁷⁴ 'child, ask your luck.' That was to be the fate of the young one that he was to enquire about his own father as to who he is. And this is the last time that there is reference to fate in the play.

Fate is referred to in Kālidāsa's works not only by any of its well-known names but also by the good or the bad result of the actions in the previous births. This is what is done in the context of Sītā's exile in the *Raghuvamśa* where Sītā ascribes her repudiation to the sin of her previous births: *mamaiva janmāntarapātakānām vipākavisphūrjathur aprasahyaḥ*.⁷⁵ Śakuntalā also does the same when she, noticing Duṣyanta penitent at what he had done to her, remarks: *nūnam me sucaritapratibandhakam purākṛtaṁ teṣu divaseṣu pariṇāmābh-imukham āsīd yena sṇūkrōśo 'py āryaputro mayi tathāvidhaḥ samvṛttaḥ*⁷⁶; 'indeed in those days a bad deed done earlier (in earlier births) was beginning to show result in that my husband, even though kind to me, had turned to be so'.

While treating Kālidāsa's belief in fate, it will not be out of point to say a word about his use of the words *bhāgya* and *bhāgadheya* in plural: *anyasaṅkrāntaḥṛdayeṣv asmākāṃ bhāgadheyeṣu*,⁷⁷ *sā nindantī svāni bhāgyāni bālā*,⁷⁸ *nanv īdrśāni tapasvinyā bhāgadheyāni*,⁷⁹ *na ma āśāsīd ātmano bhāgadheyeṣu*,⁸⁰ *vatsa te bhāgadheyāni prccha*.⁸¹ Fate is always singular, nowhere is it fates. Why then *bhāgyāni* and not *bhāgyam* or *bhāgadheyāni* and not *bhāgadheyam*? Probable it is that the plural here refers to the series of fateful incidents that have led to the unhappy consummation. The plural in *bhāgyāni* in *sā nindantī svāni bhāgyāni bālā* suggests the different vicissitudes of Śakuntalā's life.⁸² Her falling in love with a stranger (*ājñātaḥṛdaya*), his mind unknown, the slipping of her ring in Somatīrtha, her repudiation by Duṣyanta and her mortification at that. The plural in *bhāgadheyāni* in *īdrśāni tapasvinyā bhāgadheyāni* refers to the chance turn of events: Durvāsas's curse, the loss of the signet ring by which the king's heart even though awakened again and again remained asleep and its accidental discovery.⁸³ The same in *vatsa te bhāgadheyāni prccha* refers to the strange turn of events that have led to the present consummation in father and the son not knowing each other and may also shape things one way or the other. *Bhāgadheyāni* suggests everything: Bharata's birth after his mother's repudiation, his upbringing, even though a prince, in a hermitage in the company of hermits and the wild beings as also the possibilities, as explained by Kale, one, of Bharata being accepted as his son by the king and his becoming an emperor one day, and the other, of his spending his whole life in a hermitage.⁸⁴

An explanation along the same line could well be possible for the plural in *bhāgadheyeṣu* both in *anyasaṅkrāntaḥṛdayeṣv asmākāṃ bhāgadheyeṣu*,⁸⁵ of the *Mālavikāgnimitra* and *na ma āśāsīd ātmano bhāgadheyeṣu*,⁸⁶ of the *Abhijñānaśākuntala*. A far better explanation for plural in all the cases cited above could well be that it refers to the actions, good or bad, of the previous births which result in fruits, good or bad, in the present one. These actions when taken severally need plural for expression; when

taken collectively need singular: *bhāgyam*, *daivam*, *vidhiḥ*, *ṛtāntaḥ*, etc. Hence the use of both by Kālidāsa. Though plausible, both the explanations leave the question of the exclusive use of plural in *bhāgadheya* by Kālidāsa unanswered. Could it be due just to current usage?

As for the poems of Kālidāsa, there is no mention of fate in the *Rtusamhāra*. In the *Meghadūta*, however, there is reference to it in four places. In the very beginning of the work the Yakṣa refers to his mendicancy before cloud on account of his separation from his dear one due to (adverse) fate: *tenārthitvaṁ tvayi vidhivaśād dūrabandhur gato 'ham*.⁸⁷ Later while telling the cloud about the likely condition of his consort in his absence he (the Yakṣa) again refers to fate due to which her thigh has to do without the wonted net of pearls: *muktājālaṁ ciraparicitaṁ tyājito daivagatyā*.⁸⁸ Still later in the message to the cloud he makes mention of the adverse fate blocking his way in making him unite, through the imaginative faculty, his body with that of his beloved: *aṅgenāṅgam.....saṅkalpais tair viśati vidhinā vairiṇā ruddhamārgaḥ*.⁸⁹

Further on he ascribes to fate absence of union with the beloved even in dream by robbing him of the sight by ever-increasing torrent of tears:

*asrais tāvan muhur upacitair drṣṭir ālupyate me
krūras tasminn api na sahate saṅgamaṁ nau ṛtāntaḥ* ||⁹⁰

The *Raghuvamśa* mentions fate in half a dozen places, first time in the context of the chance development of friendship between Priyamvada, a Gandharva Prince, rescued by an accidental shot of an arrow from elephanthood imposed upon him by sage Mataṅga and Aja, the scion of the Ikṣvākus, on the way to Indumatī's Svayamvara:

*evam tayor adhvani daivayogād āseduṣoḥ sakhyam
acintyahetu*⁹¹

The next mention of fate is in the context of the comparison of Indumatī's turning away from the Kāliṅga ruler, though tempted by Sunandā, as does the goddess of fortune from an

unfortunate fellow though brought from a distance by him through exertion:

tas mād apāvartata dūrakṣṣṭā nītyeva lakṣmīḥ pratikūladaivāt^{P2}

Aja in his lamentations at the death of Indumatī refers to fate three times. He is not able to make out as to how even flowers, the most delicate of the things, could take away the life of a person. If they even can do so, argues he, what other things could not be enough for fate, if only it is to strike:

*kusumāny api gātrasaṅgamāt prabhavanty āyur apohitum yadi
na bhaviṣyati hanta sādhanam kim ivānyat prahariṣyato
vidheḥ*^{P3}

He thinks that it is due to his adverse fate that the Creator turned the garland into thunderbolt:

athavā mama bhāgyaviplavād aśaniḥ kalpita eṣa vedhasā^{P4}

He blames his own deeds, what actually fate is, for what has befallen him:

sahatām hatajīvitam mama prabalām ātmakṛtena vedanām^{P5}

The next and the last reference to fate in the work is when, after Sītā is carried to the nether world by the earth and the agitated Rāma takes up his bow to get her back from her (the earth), Vālmiki and Vasiṣṭha pacify him by letting him realize the inexorableness of the working of fate:

gurur vidhibalāpekṣī śamayāmāsa dhanvinaḥ^{P6}

Fate finds mention in the first eight cantos of the *Kumāra-sambhava*, generally accepted to be genuine, in at least four places out of which three pertain to Rati after the burning of Kāma. In the earliest of these fate is said to be wishing to make Rati regain consciousness with a desire to making her experience new widowhood with its unbearable pangs:

*atha mohaparāyaṇā satī vivaśā kāmavadhūr vibodhitā
vidhinā pratipādayiṣyatā navavaidhavyam asahyavedanam*^{P7}

Rati on regaining herself indulges in the most pathetic lamentations. She accuses fate to have cheated her; *vidhinā jana*

*eṣa vañcitaḥ*⁹⁸, it is on Kāma that the happiness of the people depends; *tvadadhīnam khalu dehinām sukham*⁹⁹. While addressing Vasanta, the friend of her husband, she charges fate with committing half the butchery in killing Kāma while sparing her: *vidhinā kṛtam ardhavaiśaṣaṁ nanu mām kāmavadhe vimuñcatā*.¹⁰⁰

The fourth reference to fate is in the context of drinking of wine offered by the presiding deity of the Gandhamādana forest by Pārvatī and undergoing a change thereby, which, though a change, was attractive like the common mango tree changing into the Sahakāra kind due to the inscrutable working of fate:

*apratarkyavidhiyogakāritām āmrateva sahakāratām yayau*¹⁰¹

Was Kālidāsa a Fatalist?

With so much of prominence of fate in Kālidāsa's works one is tempted to ask the question: Was Kālidāsa a fatalist? Did he believe that everything was predestined, determined by actions, good or bad in previous births? Did he believe in independence of action in any form in the present birth? It is difficult to answer this question with a degree of precision. Kālidāsa does seem to believe in independent action to a point after which he appears to resign himself to fate. This seems to come out of the message of Kaṇva for Duṣyanta. He first asks the latter to do this or to do that. Soon thereafter he leaves everything to fate: *bhāgyāyattam ataḥ param*. Man can go in shaping things to a certain extent only beyond which he has no control over them and has to follow the path charted out for him by Destiny.

Intuition versus Tradition

Though Kālidāsa is a firm believer in tradition he does not think it is completely unchanging and static. Tradition, according to him, has to inter-mingle with individual experience. In the last analysis it is one's own self that is to guide one in one's conduct. In matters of doubt, says he, it is the voice of conscience, the inclination of the heart, that is to prevail: *satām hi sandehapadeṣu vastuṣu pramāṇam antaḥkaraṇapravṛttayaḥ*.¹⁰²

Conclusion

Kālidāsa was one of those few poets who were not motivated in their work by only material or mundane considerations. While striving to achieve the three-fold aim of life, the three *Puruṣārthas*, Dharma, Artha and Kāma, he pinned his sight on the fourth one, Mokṣa. In the beginning he was, like any other of his ilk, motivated in his literary activity by considerations of fame:¹⁰³ *kavi-yaśahprārthī*,¹⁰⁴ a mundane consideration indeed. But as and as he had progressed in his literary activity, he seems to pray for himself-- it is with this that he closes his immortal work, the *Abhijñānaśākuntala*-- not anything material but only emancipation from rebirth: *mamāpi ca kṣapayatu nīllohitaḥ punarbhavaṃ parigataśaktir ātmabhūḥ*.¹⁰⁵ Kālidāsa's prayer seems to have been answered. For the past two thousand years or so none has equalled him. God does not seem to have endowed his soul with another body.

Note

The following editions of Kālidāsa's works have been used in this article

- (i) *Vikramorvaśīya*, (*Vikra.*) ed. Shankar Pandurang Pandit, Sanskrit Series No. XVI, Bombay, 1901.
- (ii) *Mālavikāgnimitra* (*Mal.*) ed. M.R. Kale, The Standard Publishing Co., Bombay, 1918.
- (iii) *Abhijñānaśākuntala* (*Abh. Śā*) ed. M.R. Kale, Gopal Narayan & Co., Bombay, 1920.
- (iv) *Raghuvamśa* (*Ragh.*) Nirnaya Sagar Press, Bombay, 1920.
- (v) *Kumārasambhava* (*Ku. Sam.*) ed. M.R. Kale, Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi, 1981.
- (vi) *Meghadūta* (*Megh.*) ed. M.R. Kale, Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi, 1974.

REF153

REFERENCES

1. *Abh. Sa.* Act IV, verse 1
 2. *ibid.*, Act I, p.15.
 3. *Megh.*, verse I
 4. *Ragh.*, 1.76.
 5. *ibid.*, V. 53.
 6. *ibid.*, VIII. 80.
 7. *ibid.*, IX. 78.
 8. *ibid.*, X. 47.
 9. *ibid.*, XI. 14.
 10. *ibid.*, XIX. 48
 11. *Ku. Sam.*, IV. 42-3.
 12. *ibid.*, IX.16.
 13. *Vikr.*, Act III, Viṣkambhaka
 14. *Ku. Sam.*, IX.9.
 15. *ibid.* IX.16.
 16. *Megha.*, I
 17. *Ragh.*, XII. 57
 18. *ibid.*, IX.80
 19. *ibid.*, IX.80
 20. *ibid.*, 1.25
 21. *Abh.Sā.*, V.25
 22. *ibid.*, V.24.
 23. *ibid.*, Act V, p. 133.
 24. *Ragh.*, I.13.
 25. *ibid.*, III.34.
 26. *ibid.*, III.34
 27. *ibid.*, VI. 32.
 28. *ibid.*
 29. *Megha.*, Uttaramegha, Verse 21
 30. *ibid.*, verses 14-18.
 31. *Abh. Śā.* Act 1. p. 17.
 32. *ibid.*, *Act*, II.13.
 33. *Ragh.*, VIII.4.
- Manu also supports this:

*nābrahma kṣatram ṛdhnoti nākṣatram brahma vardhate |
brahma kṣatram ca saṃprkṭam iha cāmutra vardhate ||*
IX.322

34. *Ragh.*, XV. 3
35. *ibid.*, V.2
36. *Abh. Śā.*, Act V, p.118.
37. *ibid.*, Act I, p.15.
38. *Abh. Śā.*, Act VII. p. 191.
39. *ibid.*, Act VII, p. 189.
40. *Ragh.*, XIV.70
41. *Ku.Sam.*, V.2
42. *Abh. Śā.*, VII.21
43. *Ragh.*, XIV.57
44. *ibid.*, XIV.61
45. *ibid.*, XIV.62
46. *ibid.*, XIV.66
47. *Abh.Śā.*, V.30
48. *ibid.*, Act VII, p.194.
49. *ibid.*
50. *Mal.*, Act I, p. 21.
51. *ibid.*, Act V. 19
52. *Vikr.* Act II, p. 65.
53. *ibid.*, Act II. 21
54. *Vikr.*, Act II, p. 66.
55. *ibid.*, Act IV, pp. 95-96
56. *ibid.*, Act III, p. 97.
57. *Ku. Sam.*, VI. 86.
58. *Vikra.*, Act III. p. 71.
59. *ibid.*, Act V, p. 161.
60. *Mal.*, Act IV, p. 85.
61. *ibid.*, Act V, p. 89.
62. *ibid.*, p. 89.
63. *ibid.*
64. *ibid.*
65. *Abh. Śā.*, Act I, p. 15.
66. *ibid.*,
67. *ibid.*, p. 17.
68. *ibid.*, Act V, 30.
69. *ibid.*, Act VI, p. 150.

70. *ibid.*, Act VI, p. 152.
71. *ibid.*, p. 156.
72. *ibid.*, Act VII, p. 192.
73. *Abh. Sa.*, p. 193.
74. *ibid.*, Act VII, p. 194.
75. *Ragh.*, IV. 62.
76. *Abh. Sa.*, Act VII, p. 194.
77. *Mal.*, Act IV, p. 85.
78. *ibid.*, Act V, 30.
79. *ibid.*, Act VI, p.150.
80. *ibid.*, Act VII, p.192.
81. *ibid.*, Act VII, p. 194.
82. That also is M.R. Kale's view. See his note, p. 129.
83. Kale, merely attempts the sense of *bhāgadheyāni* here when he interprets it as adverse luck, *duradr̥ṣṭa* of the *Kumārasantoṣiṇī* of Ramendra Mohan Bose (Atma Ram & Sons., Lahore, p. 583), see his Notes pp. 138-9. He does not explain the plural in the form.
84. Gajendragadkar's Comment:
The natural but very touching question of Sarvadamana as to who Duṣyanta was brings to Śakuntalā's mind all her previous history, commencing her first meeting with the king. She realizes what important part divinity has played in shaping the ends of her life and replies to Sarvadamana that he should appeal to his own fortune to get an answer to his question. It was impossible for Śakuntalā to give a direct and definite reply to her son's innocent but so dreadfully touching question. *Abhijñānaśākuntala*, Seventh Edition, The Popular Publishing House, Surat, 1962.
85. Kale interprets it as 'our good luck, being loved by you' (see Notes p. 99) having got transferred to some one else. There is no comment of his or Devadhar's or of anybody else on the plural used.
86. Here also *bhāgadheyeṣu* is explained by Kale, see his Notes p. 163, as 'good fortune' or *svakīyasaujanyaśvāmi-prāptiviṣaya*. The *Kumārasantoṣiṇī* of Ramendra Mohan Bose, leaves the plural unexplained. It may, as in other cases, refer to the strange turn of events, her being in the upper regions and the coming of her husband there of his own accord to receive her back.

87. *Pūrvamegha*, verse 6.
88. *Uttaramegha*, verse 35.
89. *ibid.*, verse 41.
90. *ibid.*, verse 44.
91. *Ragh.* V. 60.
92. *ibid.*, VI. 58.
93. *ibid.*, VIII. 44.
94. *ibid.*, VIII. 47.
95. *ibid.*, VIII. 50.
96. *Ragh.*, XV. 85.
97. *Ku. Sam.*, IV.1.
98. *ibid.*, IV.10.
99. *ibid.*
100. *ibid.*, IV.31.
101. *ibid.*, VIII.78
102. *Abh. Śā.*, Act 1.20
103. Mammaṭa mentions *yaśas*, fame, as the first of the motivations for composing poetry.
104. *Ragh.*, 1.3
105. *Abh. Śā.*, VII. 35.

V

***Mr̥cchakaṭika*—A Reassessment**

Introductory

Sanskrit dramaturgists list ten varieties of play, Rūpaka as they call it. Of these it is the Nāṭaka variety which has been widely pursued. The next in frequency is the Nāṭikā variety. Still next is the Prakaraṇa variety to which the *Mr̥cchakaṭika* belongs. Its lesser pursuit probably was due to its inordinate length. It has got to have ten Acts with varied sentiments and characters. Out of the few Prakaraṇas available in extant Sanskrit literature the *Mr̥cchakaṭika* stands out as a category in itself being the only social play of its type. Its main theme is the love affair between a courtesan and a Brahmin merchant reduced to utmost penury, thanks to his overindulgence in munificence. In between are thrown up to form its social mosaic gamblers, thieves, the go-betweens and a sustained dose of political intrigue.

The Author

The very start of the play is curious. It opens with a statement about its author who on reaching up to the age of hundred years and ten days had entered into fire: *labdhvā cāyuh śatābdaṃ daśadinasahitaṃ śūdrako 'gnim praviṣṭaḥ*, prompting the scholarly community to scurry for discovering its real author,

Inaugural Address at the National Seminar on "*Mr̥cchakaṭika* : Reassessment in 21st Century", The Asiatic Society, Kolkata, January 5, 2005. Chair : Prof. Biswanath Banerji, President of the Society.

because of the impossibility of the author, as recorded in the Prologue, speaking of his own death. Notwithstanding this impossibility in popular perception, he, Śūdraka, is its author. Who he was and in which period he flourished would continue to occupy the attention of scholars as it has done over the past century or so.

Poetic Flashes

While the greatness of this mythical Śūdraka as a playwright is beyond question, he having evolved a play out of a mosaic of conflicting situations with unflagging interest, his greatness as a poet has not met with as much notice of connoisseurs as it should have. An instance *par excellence* of this is his description in Act V of a rainy day with sky overcast with as many as forty different similes, fancies and metaphors, perhaps the largest number, for the description of a given phenomenon in the entire range of Sanskrit literature. The clouds of the day are compared to the hearts of separated women: *viyuktavanitāhṛdayānukārāḥ*¹, they are as dark as the lordly elephants: *gajendramalinaiḥ*² or the wet Tamāla leaves: *ārdratāmālapatramalinaiḥ*³ or the herd of buffaloes: *mahiṣakulanilaiḥ*⁴ or the dark snakes: *nīlaiḥ sāndram ivāhibhir jaladharaiḥ*⁵ or a parasol-like canopy for the world, *jaladacchatrāpidhānam*⁶. They rush against each other like elephants *gajā ivānyonyam abhidravantaḥ*⁷. With their thunder jump up the peacocks which appear fanning the sky with their spread out plumage: *yeṣāṃ raveṇa sahasotpatitair mayūraiḥ kham vījyate*⁸. They envelop the moon as do the men who bring disgrace to their families, the renunciation, Saṁnyāsa: *saṁnyāsaḥ kuladūṣaṇair iva janair meghair vṛtaś candramāḥ*⁹. The lightning in them is like a woman of low family who does not stay at one place : *vidyun nīcakulodgateva yuvatir naikatra santiṣṭhate*¹⁰. It also serves as a golden torch for scouting the palaces: *kāñcanadīpekeva racitā prāsādasāñcārīṇī*¹¹. The cloud is looked upon as king whose showers are its arrows which on account of their white colour appear bejewelled: *dhārāpātair maṇimayaśaraiḥ*¹². Since a king is to have a flag, it is the lightning

which serves as the same for the cloud king. The cranes are this king's white turban and the lightning the chowrie. The condition of the sky at the time the playwright describes with an unmatched chain of fancies:

*vidyudbhir jvalatīva khaṁ vihasatīvocair balākāśatair
māhendreṇa vivalgaṭīva dhanuṣā dhārāśarodgāriṇā
vispaṣṭāśaniniḥsvanena rasatīvāghūrṇatīvānilair
nīlaiḥ sāndram ivāhibhir jaladharair dhūpāyatīvāmbaramAA*¹⁴

'The sky is as if blazing owing to lightning flashes, as if laughing boisterously owing to hundreds of cranes, as if galloping about owing to Indra's rainbow discharging arrows in the form of showers, as if shouting up owing to the very distinct noise of thunder, as if reeling due to winds and as if throwing incense densely owing to the dark snake-like clouds.'

Even outside of this lengthy description which in volume and innovation in going in for divining appropriate standards of comparison, almost a feat indeed, his similes and metaphors have freshness and novelty about them. His stanza

*limpaṭīva tamo 'ṅgāni varṣatīvāñjanam nabhaḥ
asatpuruṣaseveva dṛṣṭir viphalatām gatā*||

in describing the pitch darkness clinging to (lit. besmearing) the limbs as it were and giving the appearance of the sky showering forth collyrium leading to the failure of the eyesight—and here comes the most unusual of the similes—like the service to a bad person, is well-known enough. Equally well-known are his other stanzas or prose passages like *sukhaṁ hi duḥkhāny anubhūya śobhate ghanāndhakāreṣv iva dīpadarśanam*¹⁶, "happiness indeed shines after experience of miseries like the sight of a lamp in the midst of pitch darkness" occurring in the context of Cārudatta running down his poverty which has striking parallel in Kālidāsa's statement *yad evopanataṁ duḥkhāt sukhaṁ tad rasavattaram*

(*Vikramorvaṣīya*, III.21)

or *chidreṣv anarthā bahulībhavanti*¹⁷

"troubles multiply at weak points" occurring in the context of evidence after evidence going against Cārudatta or *ayaṁ paṭaḥ samvṛta eva śobhate*,¹⁸ "this cloth looks good when folded only"

occurring in the context of the gambler Darduraka trying to hide himself from his colleague Sabhika by covering himself with an upper garment but not able to do so for its having gone into tatters or *sāhase śrīḥ prativasati*,¹⁹ “fortune favours the brave” occurring in the context of Śarvilaka’s rejoinder to his lady love Madanikā for his having attempted a rash deed or *niśāyām naṣṭacandrāyām durlabho mārgadarśakah*,²⁰ “in the night with no moon it is hard to get one who can show the way” occurring in the context of Śarvilaka appreciating Madanikā’s suggestion to return the bunch of stolen ornaments to Cārudatta by posing as one of his kin, have become household words in Sanskrit. Nothing can be more creditable for the playwright than the fact that one of his stanzas

*ālāne grhyate hasī vājī valgāsu grhyate |
hrdaye grhyate nārī yady etan nāsti gamyatām |*²¹

“an elephant is held by the tying chain, a horse by the reins, a woman by the heart. If you do not have this, then just get off” has been adopted as such by Viṣṇuśarman in his *Pañcatantra*.

The playwright is expert in delineating a phenomenon in all its repercussions. See what happens to a person when he turns poor:

*dāridryāt puruṣaśya bāndhavajano vākye na santiṣṭhate
susnigdā vimukhībhavanti suhrdaḥ sphārībhavanty āpadaḥ |
sattvaṁ hrāsam upaiti śīlaśaśinaḥ kāntiḥ parimlāyate
pāpaṁ karma ca yat parair api kṛtaṁ tat tasya sambhāvyaṭi*²²

“Owing to poverty a man’s relatives do not stand up to or act up to his words, extremely intimate friends turn their faces away, the troubles multiply, the spirit gets low, the lustre of the moon of good character fades away, whatever sin others have committed is ascribed to him”.

*saṅgam naiva ca kaścid asya kurute sambhāṣate nādarāt
samprāpto grham utsaveṣu dhaninām sāvajñam ālokyate |
dūrād eva mahājanasya viharaty alpachchado lajjayā
manye nirdhanatā prakāmaṁ aparaṁ śaṣṭham
mahāpātakam |*²³

“Nobody associates with him, nor talks to him respectfully, feeling shy, he in scanty clothes keeps a distance from big people,

the rich men look at him with disdain on occasions of festivities in their houses. Poverty is the sixth big sin'." How life-like it is! The playwright has drawn a real sketch of the kind of experience a poor man has to undergo in life.

Vocabulary

It would be good to take a break from here and to pass on to the vocabulary. Since the playwright has to describe people in different vocations he permits himself the use of words going well with them, the words like *gaṇḍa* for pledge, the gambler Sabhika asks the loser Saṁvāhaka who expresses his inability to pay up the ten Suvarṇas that he is to pay: *are gaṇḍam kuru kuru*²⁴, *pratipuruṣa* for a dummy, Śarvilaka uses the word after breaking in Cārudatta's house to check whether the two men are feigning sleep or not: *pratipuruṣam niveśayāmi*²⁵, I send in the dummy; for feigning the sleep he uses the word *lakṣyasupta*²⁶ in contrast to really asleep for which he has the word *paramārthasupta*. He has the device called *āgneya kīṭa*²⁷, the fire insect which can extinguish fire with its wings. In the gamblers' scene a number of words relevant to the game of dice are used. One such is *pāṭha* in the sense of turn, *mama pāṭhaḥ mama pāṭhaḥ*²⁸, it is my turn, it is my turn, the gamblers quarrel among themselves about their turn. The other word is *kattā*, the sound of the throwing of the dice: *kattāśabdo mano harati*²⁹.

Still other words are *tretā* the Tray, *pāvāra* the Deuce, *nardita* the Ace and *kaṭa* the Four:

Dardurakaḥ—*tretāhṛtasarvasvaḥ pāvarapatanāc ca
śoṣitaśarīraḥ*

*narditadarśitamārgaḥ kaṭena vinipātito yāmi*³⁰

The other peculiar words are *vyāghārīta*³¹, fried, occurring in the speech of Śākara which shows the origin of the much used Hindi word, *baghār*; *bhojaka*, dignitary occurring in the Śākara's address *aho adhikaraṇabhojakāḥ*³², O the court dignitaries; *vadhyapālīkā*, the turn to kill occurring in the context of the Cāṇḍālas who clamour to claim turn in Cārudatta's execution: *aye mamātra vadhyapālīkā (mama vadhyapālīkā)*³³; *dvārbbhāva*³⁴ in

the sense of means occurring in the context of the judge describing his duties: *dvārbhāve paratattvabaddhahṛdayaḥ*.

The playwright seems to have a liking for certain words. One such is *kalyavarta* in the sense of trifle, bagatelle which is used seven times in the play in different contexts and with reference to different objects; in the context of quarrel between the gamblers where one of them Darduraka intending to assist the loser Saṁvāhaka speaks of the ten *suvarṇas* as just *kalyavarta* to which the other gambler, Sabhika, the winner, objects, *nanu daśasuvarṇaṁ kalyavartaṁ bhaṇati*³⁵; in the context of Madanikā—*strīkalyavartasya kāraṇena ubhayam api saṁśaye nikṣiptam*³⁶, Cārudatta murdering Vasantasenā for the sake of a little money, *arthakalyavartasya kāraṇāt*³⁷ and so on.

The word *drona* occurs twice in the play, first in the company of *megha*³⁸ and the other time in that of *vṛṣṭi*³⁹, the occasion being the sudden unexpected fulsome help at the last moment. *Drona* is explained on the authority of texts on Astronomy as the cloud that fills the crops: *dronaḥ sasyaprapūrakāḥ*:

*āvarto nirjalo meghaḥ saṁvartaś ca bahūdakaḥ
puṣkaro duṣkarajalo dronaḥ sasyaprapūrakāḥ*||

A few more noticeable words over here. *Khalīkriyate* the play uses in the sense of crushed, ill-treated: *ayaṁ dyūtakaraḥ sabhikena khalīkriyate*.⁴⁰ *Samsthāpanā* in it means consolation: *saṁsthāpanā priyatamā virahāturaṇām*⁴¹. The derivatives from √*duṣ* like *dūṣaṇa*, *dūṣita* are used in a variety of meanings far removed from each other. At one place *dūṣaṇa* has the meaning of breaking in, burglary: *para-grhādūṣaṇaniścitaikavīram*⁴², at another place of imputing a motive: *Adhikaraṇikaḥ—grahaṇam cānilasyeva cārudattasya dūṣaṇam*⁴³. *Dūṣita* in one place means apprehensive: *Cārudattaḥ—prabhavati yadi dharmo dūṣitasyāpi me 'dya*⁴⁴, at another place loosened: *dūṣiteyaṁ bhūmiḥ kṣāra-kṣiṇā*⁴⁵ and at still another place contaminated, soiled and tarnished: *śareṇeva viṣāktena dūṣitenāsmi dūṣitaḥ*⁴⁶, *kevalam dūṣitam yaśaḥ*⁴⁷.

It will be a good idea if some younger scholars were to take up the linguistic appraisal of the play under the guidance of a

senior one. It will be a rewarding study indeed, not undertaken so far. Too much has been written on topics like the date and the author of the work or its characters or the state of the society and culture depicted in it. But the study in areas like its in-depth linguistic and stylistic analysis still remains a desideratum.

Word-pictures

Whenever the playwright is to describe a particular event he goes on all fours to sketch it in all its decibles, be it gambling, theft or court trial or execution. He likes to make his spectators or readers to have a full view of it in all its details. How the gamblers gamble, how the loser dodges the winner, how he tries to outmanoeuvre him, how he is caught and thrashed, how even though in hiding he finds the sound of the throw of the dice irresistible, how his companion out to help quarrels with the one chasing him and in the course of that throws dust in his eyes, and provides an opportunity to his friend to slip away. The entire scene is captured as such. The same is the case with the court scene. An employee cleans the court-room, arranges the seats. Enters the judge, the Adhikaraṇika, together with the Assessors, the Śreṣṭhin and the Kāyastha. Call is given to the plaintiffs to file their suit. The case is argued, the person charged with crime is questioned, the witnesses are called for and are cross-examined, and the judgement delivered subject to its ratification by the final arbiter, the king. It is interesting to note from the words of the judge as to the kind of people he has to deal with, the people who hide truth, who when provoked would admit to crime, the people who though good otherwise would utter half truth—a situation that has remarkable similarity with the one prevailing in courts in India in the present time. That the judiciary in the time of the playwright was not free from the influence of the executive is also hinted at. The judge initially is not in a mood to hear the case of Śakāra under the apprehension that it could be a complicated one and says that his case cannot be taken up. But when he (Śakāra) threatens to report against him to the king, he yields and agrees to admit the case.

Coming to the theft scene, we find that it is depicted in the play step by step. It is early hours. The thief Śarvilāka makes a breach in the fencing wall of the grove of trees round the house of Cārudatta and enters the middle region. He has now to break through to reach the inner quadrangle and has then to look for a place which may drown the sound of his footsteps, where the earth would be loose due to the sprinkling of water, a wide breach in the wall not noticeable to others, the brick masonry less strong with the corrosion of salt petre and with no woman around. As a good sign for him he finds the earth loose and a pile of rubbish drawn out by the mice. Since there are baked bricks in the walls, he has no option except to pull them out. His sacred thread he uses as a measuring tape for the hole to be carved out. With only one brick left a snake bites his finger. His sacred thread again comes to his rescue. He ties the finger with it to avoid the poison spreading in the body. He comes to the quadrangle but the door through which he is to pass now being old, screeches. He first thinks of sprinkling water on it to silence the screeching but finds it inadvisable for the sound it may generate if splashed. He then waits outside the door and finding two persons inside asleep first wants to make sure as to whether they are actually asleep or feigning it. He sends in a dummy first. He finds in the quadrangle only musical instruments inferring thereby that the owner of the house is poor. But he has to make sure that he is really so and has no wealth buried underground. For this he adopts the tactic of scattering magical seeds. Their not expanding convinces him that the owner is really poor. At this crucial moment the dream speech of the jester in which he requests sleeping Cārudatta to take possession of the bunch of gold ornaments makes him take possession of them and decamp.

The entire scene shows the playwright's intimate acquaintance with the methods, the means and the strategy of the thieves or the art of theft, if it can be called as such. Interestingly, there are patron deities for such activities like Kumāra Kārtikeya to whom prayers are offered before undertaking them or at the end when the mission is successful. The thieves call themselves

Skandaputras, the sons of Skanda: *prathamam etat skandaputrāṇām siddhilakṣaṇam*⁴⁸. It is a matter of investigation as to how Skanda came to be associated with such nefarious activities. Further, the thief refers to certain *ācāryas*, the authorities on the art like Kanakaśakti who have recorded four types of burglary, the Sandhi-bhedas, the pulling out of the baked bricks, the cutting through of the unbaked ones, the sprinkling of those made of earth clods and chipping of those of made of wood. The other *ācāryas* referred to are Bhāskaranandin and Yogācārya. The latter the thief claims as his teacher who has given him a magic ointment which would render him invisible to police and make him immune to attack by a weapon:

*namo nārādāya kumārakārttikeyāya, namaḥ kanakaśaktaye
brahmaṇya-devāya, devavratāya, namo bhāskaranandine,
namo yogācāryāya yasyāhaṁ prathamāḥ śiṣyaḥ!
tena ca parituṣṭena yogarocanā me dattā!
anayā hi samālabdham na mām draṅṣyanti rakṣiṇaḥ!
śāstram ca patitam gātre rujaṁ notpādayiṣyati!*⁴⁹

For a thief even the symbol of Brahminhood, the sacred thread is a means for the accomplishment of his mission: *yajñopavītaṁ hi nāma brāhmaṇasya mahad upakaraṇadravyam, viśeṣato 'smadvidhasya*.⁵⁰

The playwright's penchant for detail and drawing of word pictures is noticeable in his description of the mansion of Vasantasenā with its fabulous eight quadrangles where each and every object gets a minute notice in a style reminiscent of that of Bāṇa. That such a rich courtesan should have fallen in love with poor Cārudatta (with his house with screeching doors and plaster worn off and with his son playing with a clay cart) is a contrast which the playwright only was capable of conjuring up. There is *dvandva* here, the *dvandva* between affluence and penury, between a handsome and pious but a pauper merchant and a fabulously rich courtesan. It is again a contrast that a cowherd boy takes over the reins of the kingdom by deposing the ruler and one who was waiting for the final blow on him becoming a ruler of the part of the kingdom. It is all a contrast, the *dvandva*,

which lends the *Mṛcchakaṭika* a character unique in the annals of India's and perhaps the world's dramatic literature.

The playwright has an uncanny insight into human psychology: How even lowly persons can exhibit noble tendencies in certain situations much against the spirit of their calling. It is the force of their heart that transforms them to attempt to turn a new leaf. Śarvilaka is so attached to Madanikā that he wants to rescue her from serfdom—though in the process he has to stoop to even stealing. What is noteworthy here is the motive and not the act itself. Śarvilaka is a thief, living by theft, he turns to theft to free his lady love from the bondage of slavery, a noble deed indeed, though sought to be achieved by ignoble means, a symptom of contradictions in life, something that is a fact of it. Vasantasenā is a courtesan but much against the spirit of her calling falls in for Cārudatta by the sheer pull of his qualities. His magnanimity to the point of reducing himself to penury is the magnet for her. At this point she is just a lady love and not a courtesan. Anything or any being belonging to her paramour she owns. Since Rohasena is Cārudatta's son, she has to have pity on him. She takes off her ornaments to enable him to acquire a golden cart when she notices him pining for it finding it with the child of another wealthier merchant and not willing to play with a clay cart, the *mṛcchakaṭika*—the incident which has provided the title to the play—which is a fine psychological study in capturing beings in their genuine moral form different from the one which they have to keep up in public.

Psycho-analysis

The play shows its composer a good psychologist. In most of the situations he depicts the inner conflict raging in the minds of the characters. This is so with Śarvilaka out to commit theft, with the gamblers out to play the game of dice, the mother of Vasantasenā in the act of identifying the ornaments in the court, the judge trying Cārudatta and the Cāṇḍālas preparing to executing him. Every one of them is conscious of the lowly nature and the impropriety of the work he is doing or is called upon to

do and still engaging himself or herself in it. This is the inner conflict, the *antardvandva* which the playwright has effectively portrayed. Śarvilaka, a Brahmin, is conscious of the high traditions of his family:

*aham hi caturvedavido 'pratigrāhakasya putraḥ śarvilako
nāma brāhmaṇaḥ!*

Madanikāgaṇikārtham akāryam anuṣṭhāmi...

*kaṣṭam evaṁ madanikāgaṇikārthe brāhmaṇakulam tamasi
pātitaṁ, athavā ātmā pātitaḥ!*⁵¹

dhig astu khalu dāridryam anirveditapauruṣam!

*yad etad garhitaṁ karma nindāmi ca karomi ca!*⁵²

In the gamblers scene Darduraka's words, though ostensibly uttered in praise of gambling, do betray a streak of aversion for it: *sarvaṁ naṣṭaṁ dyūtenaiva*.⁵³

The judge trying Cārudatta rues his calling in having to try a person of the qualities and calibre of Cārudatta. He has to cross-examine him. That is the legal procedure. But mark the agony of his words: *nanu vyavahāras tvāṁ prcchati*⁵⁴. His heart sinks when evidence mounts against him. He has to sentence a person whom he adores. He dilutes his judgement on the plea of his (Cārudatta's) being a Brahmin. He awards him only exile even for the crime of murder with which he is charged and which is proved by all the evidence available. It is a different matter that the king to whom the case is referred for final adjudication alters the judgement and awards death penalty. Even the Cāṇḍālas take long to carry out the execution. It is clear that in their heart of hearts they do not want to kill Cārudatta. One of them gives a poignant expression to his feelings when he asks people to get away and not to have a look at a good man losing his life with the simile of the golden pitcher sinking with its rope gone asunder which could not be more telling. Their reluctance to carry out the ghastly act is also manifest in the time they take to carry it out. They talk among themselves. When one of them refers to Cārudatta without an honorific, the other objects: *āryacārudattaṁ nirupapadena nāmnā 'lapasi*.⁵⁵ He even goes to the extent of saying that even though born in the Cāṇḍāla family they are not

Cāṇḍālas. Cāṇḍālas are they, implicating obliquely the judiciary and the monarchy, who ill-treat a good man. It is obvious from this as to how painful it was for the executioners to carry out the execution. It is a cry of anguish on their part when they say *atra rājaniyogaḥ khalv aparādhyati*⁵⁶, the order of the master is at fault, *aparādhyati*, here. The execution of Cārudatta is an *aparādha* even for the executioners! It was for no reason that the sword drawn by one of them to kill Cārudatta had missed the mark.

Playwright's knowledge of other Disciplines

The playwright had a good grasp of the various disciplines like music, the science of omens and so on. The knowledge of music is noticeable in Cārudatta's appreciation of the singing of Rebhila which is described as impassioned and sweet, smooth and distinct and full of emotion as also charming and attractive and is characterized by sweet voice, harmonized notes of the lute, high pitches, mingled with different Mūrcchanās, even on syllables, low at the close, controlled with utmost ease and repeated twice in consonance with the Rāga.

Through his foolish statements even Śākara gives expression to the belief of the time to the means which could impart melodiousness to voice. There were certain herbal preparations for this like the cuming seed and orris root brightened with Hingu and the root of Vacā as well as ginger with jaggery or dishes like that of the cuckoo meat brightened with Hingu and a dash of Marica powder fried and mixed with oil and *ghee* which could bring it about:

*bhuktām mayā pārabhṛtīyamāmsam katham nāham
madhurasvara itii*⁵⁷

The knowledge and belief in omens has evidence for it in the throbbing of the right arm, *spandate dakṣiṇo bhujah*⁵⁸ of Āryaka, a good omen for men, getting sword from Candanaka out to inspect the vehicle and that of the throbbing of the left eye of Cārudatta, a bad omen, when he gets a call from the court, *savyam me spandate cakṣuḥ*⁵⁹, the other bad omens noticed by him being the harsh notes of a crow perched on a dried up tree in the

direction of the sun and a coiled cobra blocking his path. The judge in the court being told that the king's brother-in-law has come to file a suit considers it a bad omen corroborating it with the mundane phenomenon of the eclipse at the very sunrise indicating the downfall of a great man: *Adhikaraṇikaḥ—katham prathamam eva rāṣṭriyaśyālaḥ kāryārthī? yathā sūryodaya uparāgo mahāpuruṣanipātam eva kathayati*⁶⁰ And that is precisely what happens. Cārudatta is charged with the heinous crime of murdering Vasantasenā and is sentenced to death.

Acquaintance with Regional Practices

While going through the play one cannot but be struck with the playwright's intimate acquaintance with certain habits associated with certain regions of the country. After the royal command consequent upon the escape of Āryaka that each and every vehicle is to be inspected, a covered carriage passing through the main road is first inspected by Captain Candanaka. Finding Āryaka therein he, out to help him, tells the other Captain Vīraka that it carries Vasantasenā but his demeanour and his flip-flop with the word *ārya* and *aryā* arouse suspicion in him with the result that he wants to carry out the inspection himself to which the former objects. As for his flip-flop he has the explanation that he being a southerner is indistinct in his speech: *vayam dākṣiṇātyā avyaktabhāṣiṇaḥ*⁶¹.

He then comes out with a lengthy list of languages and dialects he knows and is free to use any expression. With the possibility of being cornered, with Vīraka still insistent, he thinks of the device of picking up quarrel in the line of the people of *Karṇāṭaka: karṇāṭakalahaprayogaṁ karomi*⁶² which according to Srinivasacharya is *śuṣkakalaha*, picking up a quarrel for no reason. The Kannadigas might have had this habit during the playwright's time.

Quaint Ideas

The playwright also seems to have strange ideas about the use of Sanskrit. Women using it he does not seem to appreciate as can be inferred from the words of the *Vidūṣaka*:

*mama tāvad dvābhyām eva hāsyam jāyate—striyā
saṁskṛtaṁ paṭhantī manuṣyeṇa ca kākalīm gāyatāi
strī tāvat saṁskṛtaṁ paṭhantī dattanavanasyeva
adhikaṁ sūśabdāṁ karoti*⁶³

“For my part two things make me laugh: a woman reading Sanskrit and a man singing Kākalī. A woman reading Sanskrit aloud like a young cow having a new rope passed through her nostrils makes too much of *sū sū* sound.”

Special Features of the Play

The special features of the *Mr̥cchakaṭika* which have received notice of scholars are the plethora of characters from all walks of life, high and low, noble and ignoble, polite and impolite, pious and impious and the number of Prakrits, as many as eight indicating the proficiency of the playwright in all of them.

SOCIETY AND CULTURE

Caste and Profession : Liberality of Approach

The *Mr̥cchakaṭika* depicts a kind of society which had certain peculiarities that distinguish it from the traditional type. Let us take up the caste system first. The hero of the play Cārudatta is a Brahmin by caste and a merchant by profession with his house in the quarters of the merchants, *śreṣṭhicatvara*.⁶⁴ He does not hold on to the traditional Brahmin profession of a priest or of a teacher. In the time of the *Mr̥cchakaṭika* caste was no barrier to the rise of a person to a higher position even if belonging to a low caste, as is clear from the fake quarrel that Candanaka picks up with Viraka in the incident of inspecting a carriage. Both are police captains, called Senāpatīs in the play. While one of them is from a barber community, the other one belongs to the community of shoe-makers. Both of them run down each other on the basis of their low caste which their quarrel reveals. Śarvilaka who engages himself in burglary and boasts of his skill in breaking into the houses is a Brahmin by caste. He has no qualms in using his sacred thread, *yajñopavīta*, the symbol of his

Brahminhood as the measuring tape⁶⁵ for making a hole in the wall as also as a bandage for snake-bitten finger. His Brahminhood is awakened when the Vidūṣaka in the dream-speech asks Cārudatta to take possession of the bunch of gold ornaments to relieve him of the worry of its safe keeping. He first is prompted to take hold of it but desists from it saying that it is not proper to harass a nobly born person who is in similar circumstances: *grhṇāmi athavā na yuktaṁ tulyāvasthaṁ kulaputrajanaṁ pīdayitum, tad gacchāmi*.⁶⁶

It is only when the Vidūṣaka says that he would be cursed if he were not to take possession of the bunch of ornaments in the name of the wish of the cows and the Brahmins, *bho vayasya! śāpito 'si gobrāhmaṇakāmyayā yady etat suvarṇabhāṇḍaṁ na grhṇāsi*⁶⁷, that he turns to taking hold of the ornaments: *anatikramaṇīyā bhagavatī gokāmyā brāhmaṇakāmyā ca*⁶⁸, the cow-wish and the Brahmin-wish are not to be transgressed. So I take this.

Coming to the last Act of the play we find even the Cāṇḍālas saying that they are Cāṇḍālas because they are born in the Cāṇḍāla family. Actually the Cāṇḍālas are those who punish a noble person like Cārudatta. And finally, and that is the last blow on the caste system, it is a cowherd boy, *gopāladāraka*, who deposes the ruling king and taking over the kingdom from him shares a part of it with Brahmin Cārudatta. In his escape from the prison, it is Candanaka, a cobbler by caste, who had helped him by concealing his identity at the time of the inspection of the carriage and by handing over a sword to him. The carriage having reached the house of Cārudatta for which it was meant; it was supposed to be carrying Vasantasena who was heading for that but had boarded another carriage mistakenly as had Āryaka; it is the latter, Cārudatta, a Brahmin, who assures him when he takes refuge with him of having no fear from him, *abhayaṁ śaraṇāgatasya*.⁶⁹ It is he who has fetters from his foot removed and advises him for fear of being detected to move on with the same carriage.

The sum total of the discussion only leads to the point with which we had started that in the *Mrcchakatika* people belonging

to any caste, high or low, were free to choose for themselves any profession they liked. The people of low caste were not eternally condemned to follow the vocations of their caste. And vice versa. That does not mean that the caste system did not exist or was any the less rigid. The Śūdras were not allowed to recite the Vedas. The judge reprimands Śākāra when he accuses him of partiality, *kiṃ pakṣapātena vyavahāro dṛśyate*⁷⁰. The judge gets furious and says *Vedārthān prākṛtas tvam vadasi na ca te jihvā nipatitā*,⁷¹ a low caste fellow, you are talking of the sense of the Vedas, yet your tongue has not fallen off. In the court the Kāyastha was the Assessor along with the Śreṣṭhin but his standing in society did not elicit respect. He was compared to a snake. The court is *kāyasthasarpāspadam*.⁷²

As for a customary rule the Brahmins were not to be awarded capital punishment. They were *avadhyas* even if having committed heinous crimes like murder. The judge after hearing the case and finding Cārudatta guilty of the murder of Vasantasenā on the basis of the evidence available awards, quoting Manu, the punishment of banishment from the country with all possessions intact:

*ayam hi pātakī vipro na vadhyo manur abravītī
rāṣṭrād asmāt tu nirvāsyo vibhavair akṣataiḥ sahai*⁷³

It is a different matter that the king did not uphold the judgement and altered it to capital punishment for which he drew from Cārudatta the censure of being thoughtless: *aho avimṛśyakārī rājā pālakah*.⁷⁴

Interestingly, a person of the high caste, a Brahmin for instance, even though engaging himself in the most lowly and despicable act of burglary was conscious of his high birth: *aham hi caturvedavido 'pratigrāhakasya putraḥ śarvilako nāma*.⁷⁵

That was perhaps the reason that the noble streak coming from his family did not completely forsake him even there. He reassures Madanikā when she gets alarmed at his speaking of committing a rash act that he does not rob a woman with ornaments like a creeper in blossom, nor does he take away the

possessions of a Brahmin amassed for the sake of sacrifice, nor does he carry a child from the lap of a nurse. Even in the matter of stealing he exercises his judgement as to what should be done and what not:

*no muṣṇāmy abalām vibhūṣaṇavatīm phullām ivāham latām
viprasvaṁ na harāmi kāñcanam atho yajñārtham
abhyuddhṛtam!
dhātryutsaṁgagatām harāmi na tathā bālām dhanārthī kvacit
kāryākāryavicāriṇī mama matiś caurye 'pi nityam sthitā*⁷⁶

Possibility of Redemption of the Fallen

Now, the spotlight is to be shifted to another interesting aspect of the *Mṛcchakaṭika*. In its time a courtesan or a prostitute had a chance to be redeemed and, once fallen, was not to remain condemned or confined to that profession for ever, the society not accepting her in the family fold. Śarvilaka steals ornaments to buy freedom for Madanikā. Vasantasenā marks her look as she is engaged in a talk with him and infers from that that he is the same person who wants to make her a free woman: *sa jana etām icchaty abhujīṣyām kartum*⁷⁷.

After she is freed, she is accepted as a bride:

Śarvilakaḥ—*sudṛṣṭaḥ kriyatām eṣa śirasā vandyatām janahī
yatra te durlabham prāptam vadhūśabdāvagaṇṭhanam*⁷⁸

She has got the title of *vadhū* which is difficult to secure. As was Madanikā accepted as *vadhū* so was Vasantasenā herself. Śarvilakaḥ—*Vasantasene! parituṣṭo rājā bhavatīm vadhūśabdenānugrhnāti*,⁷⁹ the king (it is Cārudatta who is styled here as such since he was made the ruler of Kuśāvati by Āryaka on ascension to the throne by deposing Pālaka) highly pleased [with you] favours you with the title of *vadhū* [a lawfully wedded wife]. She is offered by Śarvilaka to Cārudatta with the veil on, in the style of a *vadhū*: *vasantasenām avagaṇṭhya cārudattam prati*⁸⁰.

Even the prostitutes and courtezans in the time of the *Mṛcchakaṭika* could become *vadhūs*, the legally wedded wives!

Custom of Satī

The custom of Satī was not only prevalent in the time of the *Mṛcchakaṭīka* but also glorified. The moment Dhūtā, the wife of Cārudatta, gets the news that he is to be executed, she gets ready to commit Satī. Even the consideration of the care of her son Rohasena in the absence of both the parents losing their life does not weigh with her. She tells the child who is clinging to her skirt to leave her and not come in her way: *jāta! muñca, mā vighnam kuruṣva*⁸¹. She wants to predecease Cārudatta so that she may not have to hear the unpleasant news of his death: *bibhemy āryaputrasyāmaṅgalākarnanāt*⁸². She is even prepared to court the sin which as per the reproduction of the views of the sages by the Vidūṣaka, accrues if a Brahmin women were to mount the funeral pyre without the body of the husband on it: *varam pāpācaraṇam, na punar āryaputrasyāmaṅgalākarnnam*⁸³.

The glorification of Satī comes when the release of Cārudatta from execution is attributed to the determination of the chaste wife to enter into fire: *aho satyāḥ prabhāvaḥ, yato jvalanapra-veśavyavasāyenaiva priyasamāgamam prāpitā*⁸⁴.

Religions

In the time of the *Mṛcchakaṭīka* the Brahmanical religion with its gods and goddesses, vows and fasts, heaven and hell and sacrificial system was prevalent. Buddhism also flourished alongside though not favourably looked upon, the sight of a Śramaṇa at the very start of an activity being considered inauspicious. There is mention in the work of the paraphernalia of the Buddhist monks, their *kaṣāya* garments, the *cīvaras*. A Bhikṣu is shown in the play to wash them and leave them on a pile of dry leaves for drying, the water dripping from them reviving Vasantaśenā buried by Śākara underneath. The Bhikṣus addressed the commoners as *buddhopāsaka* and *buddhopāsikā*. Their possessions, *daṇḍakuṇḍikābhājana* and their *Vihāras* all find accurate mention in the work. It seems the State did exercise some power in matters of appointment of religious heads as

should be clear from Cārudatta's order about Sthāvaraka's appointment as chief monk of all the Vihāras in the country, Cārudattaḥ—*tat prthivyām sarvavihāreṣu kulapatir ayaṁ kriyatām*.⁸⁵

Slavery

The slavery was in existence in the time of the play. The slave could be bought - Sarṁvāhaka offers himself for sale—and could be made free on payment, unless the owner were to waive off payment as in the case of Madanikā who was made *abhūjiṣyā*⁸⁶ by Vasantasenā, with no payment. The State could also grant freedom from bondage. Sthāvaraka Ceṭa was freed by Cārudatta on becoming king: *suvṛtto 'dāso bhavatu*.⁸⁷

Judicial System

Now, a word about the judicial system. There was a regular judicial procedure with the court, the judge, the assessors and a hall which provided seating arrangements. Anybody could come and file a suit. As a matter of fact, a call was given inviting people who want their cases to be heard: *kaḥ ka iha kāryārthī*. The judge was appointed by the king and held office at his pleasure, as evidenced by Śākāra episode where he, the judge, first declines to admit his case on the plea that the court programme is already crowded but relents when he, Śākāra, threatens that he would report against him to his brother-in-law, the king, and have him replaced by another judge: *yadi na drśyate tadāvuttam rājānam pālakam bhaginīpatim vijñāpya etam adhikaraṇikam dūrīkṛtyātrānyam adhikaraṇikam sthāpayiṣyāmi*.⁸⁸

It was left to the discretion of the judge to summon witnesses. The evidence accruing was committed to writing. The judge was conscious of the difficulties that lay in store for him in deciding a case. People would give garbled version of the events, they would speak half-truths and so on. He would, therefore, give full opportunity to the accused to defend himself. The confession of the accused had to be secured before the judge gave his

judgement. The judgement was in the nature of the recommendation to the king who was the final authority to award punishment. The king does not agree with the recommendation of the judge in the case of Cārudatta. He alters it from banishment to capital punishment, which he condemns in the strongest terms, attributing it to his bad counsellors. His condemnation is based on two scores—one, he, a Brahmin, is being killed; and two, the other procedure of putting him in the ordeal of poison, water, scale and fire was not resorted to, indicating thereby that there were other means to judge a person:

*viśasalilatulāgniaprārthite me vicāre
krakacam iha śarīre vīkṣya dātavyam adya!
atha ripuvacanād vā brāhmaṇam mām nihañsi
patasi narakamadhye putrapautraiḥ sametaḥ⁸⁹*

A person condemned to the gallows was taken in a procession, wearing red garments, red sandal paste marks and the garland of Karavīra flowers grown in the cemetery. The occasion marked almost like a show for the people. The criminal could be killed by the sword or impaled. The execution was carried out by Cāṇḍālas, the hangmen.

As would appear from the above, the *Mṛcchakaṭika* is a good mirror to the society of its times to some aspects of which attention has been drawn here.

NOTE

The study is based on the *Mṛcchakaṭika*, Bharatiya Vidya Prakashan, Varanasi, Delhi 1993.

Time has moved on. From the 6th or the 7th Century A.D. it has passed into the 21st century. But the human society has basically remained the same with its finer and baser instincts with their inevitable contradictions. It is not all roses with no thorns. It is not all good with no evil. As a matter of fact, how can one know what is good if there were no evil. How could one appreciate Kṛṣṇa if there were no Kāṁsa? How could one appreciate Rāma if there were no Rāvaṇa?

REFERENCES

1. V. 12
2. V. 18
3. V. 2a
4. V. 22
5. V. 27
6. V. 24
7. V. 24
8. V. 13
9. V. IV
10. *ibid.*
11. V. 20
12. V. 22
13. V. 19
14. V. 27
15. V. 34
16. I. 10
17. IX. 26
18. II. 10
19. IV. 5, p. 216
20. IV. 21
21. I. 50
22. I. 36
23. I. 37
24. p. 113
25. p. 177
26. p. 178
27. p. 181
28. p. 111
29. *ibid*
30. II. 9
31. VIII. 14
32. p. 491
33. X. 33
34. IX. 5
35. pp.124-25
36. p. 215
37. p. 490

38. X. 26
39. X. 39
40. p. 123
41. II. 3
42. III. 10
43. IX. 20
44. IV. 2
45. II. 12
46. X. 28
47. X. 27
48. p. 171
49. p. 173-4
50. p. 175
51. pp. 181-183
52. III. 19
53. II. 8
54. p. 510
55. p. 564-5
56. p. 568
57. VIII. 13-14
58. VI. 24
59. IX. 15
60. p. 484
61. p. 367
62. p. 369
63. p. 159
64. p. 101
65. p. 175
66. p. 180
67. ibid
68. p. 181
69. p. 385
70. p. 514
71. IX. 21
72. IX. 14
73. IX. 39
74. p. 544
75. p. 181
76. IV. 6

77. p. 213
78. IV. 7-4
79. p. 635
80. *ibid.*
81. p. 629
82. *ibid.*
83. p. 630
84. p. 633
85. p. 636
86. p. 213
87. p. 636
88. p. 485
89. p. 547

VI

The Story of Udayana and Vāsavadattā through the Ages

Udayana Vatsarāja, the descendant of the great Pāṇḍavas, is the ruler of Kauśāmbī. He is highly gifted in the art of flute-playing and is fond of taming wild elephants. His neighbour Caṇḍa Pradyota of Avanti, also known as Mahāsena,¹ has a daughter named Vāsavadattā.² She is young and extremely beautiful and her father intends betrothing her to Vatsarāja. He sends a messenger to Udayana asking him to be a tutor to his daughter in music and come to Avanti to teach her. The latter refuses out of sheer self-esteem and returns the messenger with the counter-message that the king himself should send his daughter to him to take lessons in music. Pradyota feels insulted and conspires to entice him; he places a large blue elephant in the forest adjoining the borders of his kingdom and keeps a body of armed soldiers concealed nearby. Arrangements are already made to inform Vatsarāja about the existence of such an auspicious elephant. As Vatsarāja is out of his capital on a hunting expedition to Veṇuvana on the frontiers of his kingdom, the elephant is placed in the Nāgavana at a distance of a couple of leagues from there. He runs to the spot with scant attendants, thinking that the blue elephant would get charmed by his lute. He approaches it all alone, but is surrounded by Pradyota's soldiers and taken as captive to Avanti.

When the news of his capture reaches Kauśāmbī his minister Yaugandharāyana with some other confidants sets out to obtain

the release of his master from Pradyota. They reach there and secretly begin to work for their mission.

Once it so happens that an elephant runs amuck and creates havoc. At this juncture Udayana's help is sought and the wild elephant is tamed by him. So he is granted some concessions for this heroic deed and is appointed music teacher to Vāsavadattā. They fall in love with each other and their love ripens through their constant meetings and the marriage is consummated by the Gandharva rites. Udayana takes Vāsavadattā into confidence and makes her willing to elope with him. For this a suitable opportunity is awaited. The conspiracy of the minister Yaugandharāyaṇa to make the she elephant 'Bhadravati' furious succeeds and they run away to Kauśāmbī.

There the king drunk with the beauty of Vāsavadattā and indulging himself wholly in merry-making and sensuousness, neglects the imperial duties completely. After some time the Vatsa Kingdom is invaded by an aggressor named Āruṇi from Pāñcāla and the king is forced to live in the village of Lāvāṇaka.

In these circumstances the only remedy the Vatsa-minister could see is an alliance with the powerful neighbouring king of Magadha and the only way of effecting this is to establish matrimonial relations with him, in other words, to wed their king to Padmāvati, the sister of Darśaka, the king of Magadha. But Udayana is too deeply attached to his queen Vāsavadattā to entertain any such proposal. Vāsavadattā's co-operation is then sought. She readily agrees with the scheme of the minister and gives her consent to lead a life of gross widowhood till it is carried out. Ultimately one day when the king is on a hunting expedition the royal pavilion is set on fire and a rumour is spread that Vāsavadattā and the minister have perished in the conflagration.

Vāsavadattā along with the minister Yaugandharāyaṇa leaves for Magadha, disguised as his sister. There she is put in the charge of Padmāvati by the minister under the pretension that she is his sister whose husband had gone abroad on a journey. Vāsavadattā lives with Padmāvati under the assumed name of Avantikā. After some time a messenger is sent by the minister of Udayana for

the hand of Padmāvati and the king's consent is sought and within a few days Padmāvati is married to Udayana. Thus, with the help of the Magadha prince and of Mahāsena the aggressor Āruṇi is defeated and the lost kingdom of Kauśāmbi is recovered. Udayana with his newly-wedded queen Padmāvati returns to his kingdom. At this point the secret of Vāsavadattā's disguise is disclosed and she is again united with her husband.

Dramatic Touches in the Story

Bhāsa while dealing with the story adds that after their elopement their marriage was recognised by Vāsavadattā's parents and was formally celebrated with their painted scrolls. Again, Vāsavadattā is entrusted to Padmāvati in a hermitage where she had come to pay her respects to the Queen Mother. The enormity of Vāsavadattā's sacrifice can be judged from her pathetic remark at the time when she is asked to weave a garland for Padmāvati's marriage.

The dramatic story of the *Svapnavāsavadatta* reads that after a few days of the royal marriage Vāsavadattā accompanies Padmāvati to a pleasure garden. At the same time King Udayana and his friend Vidūṣaka also reach there. Vāsavadattā requests Padmāvati to hide behind a bower to avoid the sight of strangers and from there she hears the king confessing his great love for Vāsavadattā.

In some other scene Vāsavadattā is informed of Padmāvati's severe headache and she rushes to the Ocean-Pavilion to comfort her. There mistaking the sleeping person for Padmāvati she sits on the bed, but soon after, from the dream talk of the sleeping person she comes to know that he is none other than her own beloved husband Udayana. Then for fear of being recognised she slips away from there.

Udayana with his newly-wedded queen and her retinue is back to his kingdom. There comes the messenger from Mahāsena with congratulations on victory and with a picture-scroll of the confirmation of the marriage of Udayana and Vāsavadattā. Out of curiosity and respect Padmāvati looks at the pictures and finds

resemblance of Vāsavadattā to Avantikā entrusted to her care. Presently, Yaugandharāyaṇa, in the guise of a Brāhmaṇa appears on the scene to claim his sister. The whole mystery is then solved by the minister and everything ends happily.

But the story as depicted by Mātṛrāja Anaṅga Harṣa differs in many respects from that of Bhāsa. In his drama *Tāpasavatsarāja* the minister has a personal interview with the Queen Vāsavadattā and acquaints her with the crisis in the State. Moreover, he takes into confidence her father Mahāsenā and induces him to force Vāsavadattā to accept the plan for the good of the State. So a letter from her father is brought to her with a demand for sacrifice. She agrees to the proposal and it is some time after the rumour of the conflagration is spread that she under the guise of a Brāhmaṇa's sister is put into the care of Padmāvatī. This helps in creating a natural atmosphere in the development of the story. Padmāvatī has been represented as already cherishing love for Udayana. The king under the prediction of a holy man goes to Magadha to marry Padmāvatī with the hope that by doing so Vāsavadattā may be recovered by him. The victory of the king's armies is reported and while on his way back to his capital he comes to Prayāga and there determines to immolate himself, being disappointed in his hope of finding Vāsavadattā. Vāsavadattā is also brought there by the minister Yaugandharāyaṇa. Out of self-reproach she also determines to immolate herself. It is so arranged that both the funeral pyres made for them are near to each other. It is when Vāsavadattā is ready to immolate herself that the minister rushes to the king (who is also preparing for the same end) with the request to protect his sister from burning herself in the fire. The king rushes towards her and both recognise each other and the mystery of the whole plot is unravelled by the minister Yaugandharāyaṇa. Both are reunited and come back to their kingdom with all good success and prosperity.

Now, there comes the story of her later life based on the two dramas of Śrīharṣa. From the point of Vāsavadattā's life both the stories run similarly. She is the seniormost queen of the realm,

enjoying all the privileges of her position. But after some time either by the tricks of the ministers or accidentally two new faces appear to share her undivided love for the king. So she grows jealous and adopts some severe means to get rid of them but to her great surprise she finds them at last her own kith and kin and forgives them and allows the king to fulfil his desire. The two targets of her cruel treatment are Sāgarikā and Ratnāvalī.

The popularity of the legend and the treatment of it in subsequent versions

Udayana the king of Vatsa is the central figure in a large number of Sanskrit stories of love and adventure. The historical Udayana appears in the Purāṇas as a ruler of the Paurava dynasty. His name appears among the twenty-nine Puru kings, tracing their lineage to Arjuna, the hero of the Mahābhārata war. They removed their capital from Hastināpura to Kauśāmbī as the former capital had been destroyed by the floods of the Ganges. But the Jeune Chronicles mention him as the fifth from the last king of the line and the successor of Śatānīka and predecessor of Vahīnara.³ From a passage in one of the Buddhist canonical writings we learn that he reigned shortly after the death of the Buddha⁴ and consequently was a contemporary of Caṇḍa Pradyota of Avanti; of Pasenadi (Prasenajit) and his son Vidudabha of Kosala; and of Bimbisāra (Jain Śreṇika) and his son Ajātaśatru of Magadha.⁵ Most of the historians of the present day agree on these points and establish matrimonial relations of Udayana with Avanti, Magadha and Aṅga kingdoms.⁶ Moreover, the literary figure of king Darśaka, the ruler of Magadha, has been identified with the famous ruler Ajātaśatru of Magadha,⁷ and Padmāvatī as his sister.

It is not possible even now to trace the origin and the growth of the legends that gathered around the figure of Udayana. But even in the canonical Pāli writings we find a few hints of his amorous traits that would make him a suitable hero for romantic adventure,⁸ just as his contemporary Pradyota had gained early an unenviable reputation for ferocity. It is, therefore, not surprising that popular fancy should have woven a story that

brings the two monarchs together in dramatic contrast, narrating the capture of Udayana through Pradyota's stratagem and the former's subsequent elopement with his captor's daughter as a prize. And who shall say in view of the romantic annals of Rajput chivalry, that there may not have been a kernel of truth in the incident?⁹

That the story of Udayana had long been popular in the secular literature of India is proved by a statement of Śrīharṣa;¹⁰ its use in the dramas of the early poet Bhāsa and many other later poets; and numerous incidental references to it in technical¹¹ works and classics.¹² Śūdraka in his *Mṛcchakaṭika* refers to Yaugandharāyaṇa arousing his friends to free his master Udayana.¹³ Dāmodara Gupta refers to the romantic story of Udayana and Vāsavadattā. The dramas *Tāpasavatsarāja*, *Viṇāvāsavadatta*, *Unmādavāsavadatta*, *Ratnāvalī* and *Priyadarśikā* are wholly based on the same theme. The fullest treatment of the Udayana legend in the Pāli literature is found in the *Dhammapada* commentary, a work of the 5th century A.D.¹⁴ Here we get an account of Udayana's earlier career, his acquisition of the lute to charm the elephants of his protector, the ascetic Allakappa, his captivity, his wooing of Vāsavadattā, and his elopement with her on a female elephant named 'Bhadravati'. This portion of the history has been briefly narrated by Buddhaghōṣa also in his commentary on the *Majjhima Nikāya*.

For the Jain account of the legend we have the *Triṣaṣṭiśalākā-puruṣacarita* of Hemacandra, the *Kumārapālpratiḥodha* of Somaprabha and the *Mṛgāvalīcaritra* of Maladhārī Devaprabha. In short, they present very few parallels to the episodes which we find in Harṣa's dramas, but in general, in the elopement episode they are more in agreement with the Buddhistic accounts than with the Kashmirian version.

Thus, we have the main current of Sanskrit and Pāli literature down to the eleventh century A.D. before we find a consecutive presentation of the tale in the two works of Kashmirian writers, the famous *Kathāsaritsāgara* (KSS) of Somadeva and the *Bṛhatkathāmañjarī* (BKM) of Kṣemendra. Both claim to be

faithful abridgments of the ancient *Bṛhatkathā* of Guṇāḍhya. But another abridgment of the ancient *Bṛhatkathā* '*Bṛhatkathā-śloka-saṁgraha*' of Budhasvāmin, which seems more faithful to the original, has proved that the Kashmirian versions are not so faithful as they claim to be.¹⁵ So with the above discussion we come to the conclusion that the legend of Udayana and Vāsavadattā had been current among the masses and literary circles for more than one thousand years till it got its legendary form in *KSS* and *BKM*. But out of the so far known authorities on the subject we think Bhāsa is the earliest and he has the first-hand knowledge of the historical as well as romantic incidents and thus has presented the story in a more faithful manner. Thus taking Bhāsa as a starting point we will consider the treatment of the story by the subsequent writers. As the two dramas, precisely on the same theme on which Bhāsa's two dramas are based, have been discovered recently, so first of all let us take them into consideration. One of them is the *Vīṇāvāsavadatta* by an anonymous author¹⁶ and closely similar in plot, style and spirit to the *Pratijñāyaugandharāyaṇa* and the other is *Tāpasavatsarāja* by Anaṅga Harṣa Mātrāja, agreeing in theme and incidents with the *Svapnavāsavadatta*. Both the dramas, *Pratijñā* and *Vīṇā* deal with the story, (leaving aside strange mythological stories of the birth of Udayana and Vāsavadattā) with the adventures and the capture of Udayana, his romance and elopement. But the most remarkable difference between the two is with regard to the central theme. In the *Pratijñāyugan-dharāyaṇa* more importance is attached to the character of the minister Yaugandharāyaṇa while in the *Vīṇā* it has become a secondary thing and the valour and the romance of Udayana have taken precedence over it. Like the story in *KSS* it begins with the anxiety of Mahāsena about the marriage of Vāsavadattā and his seeking of some boon from a god or a goddess,¹⁷ and with this inspiration follows the capture of Udayana. In *Pratijñā* it appears, the plot is executed out of a feeling of sheer jealousy and revenge and it is accidental that the romance takes place. But in the *Vīṇāvāsavadatta* it is purely guided with the intention of marrying

Vāsavadattā to Udayana.¹⁸ Moreover Bhāsa's play does not portray the beginning and the development of the romance between the hero and the heroine in its entirety. Not only that, both the principal characters do not at all appear in person on the stage; but in the *Viṇāvāsavadatta* full three acts (iv-vi) have been devoted to the beginning and the development of their love and throughout they remain on the stage. Vāsavadattā's craze for music which has simply been referred to there has been depicted with a length here in *Viṇāvāsavadatta*. The music lesson to which Bhāsa refers in the *Svapna* does not occur at all in the *Pratijñā* but in the *Viṇā* it actually takes place in a romantic atmosphere.¹⁹ The other incidents like the female elephant Bhadravati getting furious and elopement, etc. are similar in both the plays. A reference to Āruṇi, a powerful king of Pāñcāla, about whom we do not hear in later versions, is found in this play.²⁰ It is said that he has an alliance with the king of Ujjain on account of his enmity with Udayana.

The other play which stands in comparison with Bhāsa's *Svapnavāsavadatta* is the *Tāpasavatsarāja*. A comparative study of the *Svapna*, *Tāpasa* and *KSS* shows that this drama (*Tāpasavatsarāja*) agrees more with *KSS* and *BKM* than with *Svapna*. In *Svapna* we do not have any knowledge of the outlines of the minister's plot and of the active help of Vāsavadattā's brother or father in executing it. According to the legend in the *KSS*²¹ Gopāla, the brother of Vāsavadattā, is taken into confidence by the ministers Rumaṇvat and Yaugandharāyaṇa, is called from Ujjayini and the whole plan is explained to him. He goes with them and gives his consent. But in *Tāpasavatsarāja* in place of her brother her father is taken into confidence and instead of his personal presence a letter is obtained from him to persuade Vāsavadattā for the great sacrifice. On the point of Āruṇi's invasion it closely follows the dramatic rather than the legendary version and portrays Vatsarāja as deeply indulging in amorous sports, neglecting the imperial duties and quite indifferent to his formidable enemy Āruṇi of Pāñcāla.²⁴ Again there appears Nārada²⁵ before the king starts for sports to Lāvāṇaka and tells

him of the coming calamity, which will only be of temporary duration being followed by prosperity.²⁶ But in *Tāpasa* the story follows a slightly different pattern. After the supposed death of Vāsavadattā and the minister Yaugandharāyaṇa, Udayana is taken to holy Prayāga where a monk named Lāmakāyana meets him and consoles him with the prediction that he will meet his beloved queen again with the help of his second wife and thus makes him agree to marry Padmāvati. The Vidūṣaka who is himself in the know of the plot takes him to Rājagṛha where a Parivrājikā, Sāṅkrtyāyanī, has already been sent with the picture of the king to influence and persuade Padmāvati to go in for him (the king). The plan succeeds and Padmāvati following Udayana, who has become a Tāpasa, puts on the robes of an ascetic and renouncing her royal palace lives in a garden worshipping the image of King Udayana.²⁷ Vāsavadattā's meeting with Padmāvati takes place in a park as in *KSS* and not in the Tapovana as in the *Svapna*. But in the way Vāsavadattā is presented in disguise as the sister of an old Brāhmaṇa and as one whose husband has gone abroad, this drama follows Bhāsa and not *KSS* and *BKM*. where she is presented as the daughter of Yaugandharāyaṇa, an old Brāhmaṇa.²⁸

In both *KSS* and *Tāpasa*, Vatsarāja comes to Rājagṛha specially for the purpose of marrying Padmāvati; in the former in response to an invitation from the Magadha king, and in the latter directed by the prediction of the monk Lāmakāyana. In the *Svapna*, however, he is represented as having come over to Rājagṛha on some other mission. In this respect the story of *BKM* also is identical with *KSS*.²⁹ Again, according to *KSS* the king, on the prediction of Nārada, is sure that Vāsavadattā is living and that it is a plot of the ministers.³⁰ This agrees well with the consolation of the monk Lāmakāyana found in other versions of the story. The firm belief of the king in his being reunited with his beloved queen is found in both the *KSS* and *Tāpasa*. There is no reference to the unfading garland and the Tilaka in the *Tāpasa* which we find in the *KSS* and *BKM* and which leads the king to suspect that Vāsavadattā is living. The self-reproaches of

Vāsavadattā and her determination for self-immolation described at the end of the play *Tāpasavatsarāja* are also described almost identically in the KSS³¹ of which Bhāsa makes no mention.

For the meeting and reunion with Vāsavadattā all the authors choose different places. In the KSS it takes place at Lāvāṇaka after her leaving Magadha, in the *Tāpasa* also it takes place after her leaving Magadha but the place is Prayāga where both are ready to immolate themselves, out of sheer despair, on a funeral pyre. Bhāsa effects the meeting in the palace of Darśaka following the recognition of Vāsavadattā on the painted scroll. These are the major differences found in the different versions of the story.

As we have already referred to all the possible sources of Udayana's legend above, we will now briefly discuss Harṣa's treatment of the story. In both the Nāṭikās there are passing allusions to one or the other of the several episodes of the story. The author has freely utilised the sources and presented to us a changed picture of the various incidents of the legend. The amorous sports of king Udayana had long been popular in the secular and Buddhist literature which the dramatist used to the best advantage. The idea of the marriage with Ratnāvalī is probably the same as we find in the marriage of Padmāvatī described by Bhāsa and others, for it is purely for the sake of political alliance planned by the ministers and based on the prophecy of a seer or an astrologer that the husband of the particular princess will be a Samrāt. A passing reference to it is made in the narrative of Kṣemendra about Princess Padmāvatī. This is how Harṣa collected the material for the two romantic episodes of Vatsarāja's life. To depict Vāsavadattā's jealousy he might have got ample material from the life in the harems of the contemporary princes. He has depicted Udayana as a sensuous man, indulging in all kinds of pleasures; a man of Pataṇagavṛtti and Vāsavadattā as a high-minded, jealous queen. In short, Udayana is a hen-pecked husband and Vāsavadattā a jealous wife.

In the above paragraphs we have already discussed the differences in the Kashmirian versions of the *Bṛhatkathā*. There is one more faithful abridgement of the original *Bṛhatkathā*

known as *Bṛhatkathā-śloka-saṅgraha*. But there we do not get the Udayana legend in full. Only incidental references to the principal events and the personages of the story are found. The incidents connected with the birth and the early years of Udayana's life are related at length. There is an allusion to the elopement episode and to Bhadravati and Nalagiri; and mention is made of the two queens Vāsavadattā and Padmāvatī; as well as of the four ministers, Rṣabha, Rumaṇvat, Yaugandharāyaṇa and Vasantaka.

REFERENCES

1. KSS and the BKM differentiate between Pradyota and Mahāsena mentioning them as rulers of Magadha and Avanti respectively. (KSS = *Kathāsaritsāgara*; BKM = *Bṛhatkathāmāñjarī*).
2. She was born with the blessings of Vāsava (Indra) and therefore was named after him as 'given by Vāsava', i.e. *Vāsavadattā*.
3. See F.E. Pargiter, *The Purāṇa text of the Dynasties of the Kali Age*, pp. 3-8 Oxford, 1913.
4. Cullavagga 111. 12-15 ed. H. Oldenberg. *The Vinaya Piṭakam*, 2, 290-292, London, 1880.
5. *History of Ancient India* by R. S. Tripathi, p. 90; *Majjhima Nikāya* 108-Gopakamogga.
6. *History of Ancient India* by R. S. Tripathi, p. 90.
7. *Lectures on Ancient History of India* (1919) by R. D. Bhandarkar: Second Lecture.
8. Cullavagga. col. cit. *Saṃyutta Nikāya* 35-127 (Bhāradvāja sutta), ed. L. Feer London, 1894.
9. *Lectures on Ancient History of India* by Bhandarkar, pp. 58-63.
10. *Ratnā*, Act. II. St. 3. *Loke hāri ca vatsarājacaritam*. *Arthaśāstra* Book 9 Ch. 7. *Drṣṭā hi jīvataḥ punarāvṛttir yathā suyātrodayanābhyām*.
11. *Ratnā*, Act. II. St. 3.
12. *Prapyāvanṭin udayanakathākovidagrāmavṛddhān*, *Meghadūta*, 1.30.
13. *Mrc.*, Act. IV St. 26. *Uttejayāmi suhrdaḥ parimokṣaṇāya yaugandharāyaṇa ivodayanasya rājñah* (Āryaka's episode).

14. Ed. H. C. Norman 1.2. 161-231. London, 1909.
15. For a detailed study on the subject see
 - (i) "Udayana as a Historical Personage"—Vide *Cambridge History of India*, p. 187-188; 308; Dr. Bhandarkar—*Lectures on Ancient History of India*, pp. 58-63; Pargiter—*Ancient Indian Historical Tradition*, pp. 285-86.
 - (ii) (For legendary sources—P. D. Gune, "Pradyota, Udayana and Śreṇika—A Jain legend." *Annals of the Bhandarkar Research Institute*—July 1920; KSS. Book II. Taraṅga 1-6; Book III. Taraṅga 1-2; BKM, Book II, III. BSS. Sarga IV.18-20, V. 89-174.
16. Prof. C. R. Devadhar (Poona Or. Vol. X, p. 88) identifies it with *Vatsarājacarita* by Śūdraka. Shastri (Intro. to *Āścarya*, p. 28, Balamandiram Press, 1926) and Kuppuswami identify it with *Unmādavāsavadatta* of Śaktibhadra.

Note: Bhāsa's criticism of artificial elopement is definitely based on this drama.

17. In *Vīṇā* he prays to Śaṅkara and in KSS to Caṇḍī.
18. *Vīṇā*, Act, I, p. 5-16.
19. *Vīṇā*, Act, I, p. 5-16.
20. *ibid*, Act, VII—2.14-16.
21. *ibid*, Act, I, p. 8.
22. KSS. III Lambaka, Taraṅga, I, St. 22-28.
23. *Tāpasa*, Act I, 1-2.
24. *Tāpasa*, Act I, 1-2. *Hānir balasya sa taṁ viṣayopabhoge....na pāñcālāṁ veti prasabham uparinyastacaraṇam.*
25. KSS, Lambaka III, Taraṅga I, St. 44.3 *Ibid*, 52.
26. *kañcit kālāṁ ca te duḥkham bhaviṣyati na ca tvayā | tatrātimohah kartavyaḥ sukhāntaṁ bhavitā hi tat ||*
27. *Tāpasa*, Act III.
28. BKM, Book III, *Lāvāṇake padmāvatīvivāhaḥ*, st. 75. *Rājaputrī suteyaṁ me.*
29. BKM, *Lāvāṇake Padmāvatīvivāhaḥ*, 93.
30. BKM, *Lāvāṇake Padmāvatīvivāhaḥ*, 93.
31. KSS, Lambaka III, Taraṅga 2. St. 44-47, 64.
32. *ibid*, St. 10. BKM. Book III, 98-99.
33. KSS, *ibid*, St. 103-108.

VII

A Survey of Sanskrit Dūtakāvyaś

The idea of conveying messages through messengers is fairly old. Even in the Vedas Agni (Fire-god) is asked to carry the prayers of the sacrificers or their offerings to other gods. He is known as the *Devadūta* or *Vahni*, the bearer. It is through him that the *yajamāna* hopes to send his oblations to the other deities. He serves as a link between the sacrificer on the earth and the gods in the heaven. There is a distance of millions of miles between the two, yet the message is conveyed and is received by the *devas* through their *dūta*, the Agni. Agni in the Vedas is supposed to be a god with a human form, invested with life and soul. As a matter of fact, it is the deified earthly fire which is supposed to carry the message or the offerings of the *yajamāna*. Thus, the idea of things in Nature being treated as messengers goes back to a hoary past. And there is nothing improbable in it. Human emotions remain the same in all times and climes. A man widely separated from the one he holds dear would try to catch at anything that may serve his purpose. He would try that his feelings be conveyed to the person far away, that his ideas may touch his affectionate companion though he be thousands of miles away. This very idea is at the back of the sending of the presents too. By means of presents one likes to convey to the other person a measure of his feelings and emotional attachment to him but when the person is far away how is this emotional attachment to be conveyed? Even now-a-days when science and technology have annihilated distance, it is not always easy for people living far away to come together and exchange their ideas and feelings

for each other. When this is the state today, one has only to imagine as to what would have been the position in days of yore when means of communication were far too primitive and inadequate. Going out to a distant land would not mean a transient separation but keeping away for a long time, may be, for all time. In that event it was natural for people in those days to see any moving thing and then under the emotional stress think that it would convey an element of their mental agony to the person far away. This is the background of Nala's sending a *haṁsa* to Damayantī, his sweetheart. The story as it goes in the *Mahābhārata* is that King Nala, fascinated by the news of the charms and beauty of Damayantī deputed a *haṁsa* to convey to her that he (Nala) is in love with Damayantī. Now, Nala's employment of *haṁsa* as his *dūta* is very ingenious. The *haṁsa* goes to Damayantī's palace and delivers Nala's message. Damayantī is then smitten with love and thus both the lovers are equally attracted towards each other. It is this love which ultimately culminates into Nala's marriage with Damayantī. This was the traditional inspiration for Kālidāsa to pick up a cloud as messenger. The idea of employing a messenger for conveying messages was fairly old but Kālidāsa made a bold departure, in that he employed an inanimate cloud as messenger. Hithertofore from the scanty material available with us we can say that only animate beings had been employed as messengers. But the poet Kālidāsa's Muse could not be fettered by tradition. Its flight brought it to the regions where the difference of animate and inanimate ceases due to emotional stress and strain: *prakṛtikṛpṇāś cetanācetanēṣu*. It becomes a living organism full of sentiments, emotions and feelings. It is addressed as 'brother'. The cloud is no doubt presented as a man. Kālidāsa attributes to it all the feelings of a man, and the tender emotions that the Yakṣa experiences. In spite of all the superstructure that has been raised to make the cloud appear a living being its inanimateness peeps out. It is a human being in Kālidāsa's *Meghadūta* who thinks and speaks through the cloud. The cloud always remains in the background. The Yakṣa is always in the foreground. In his

moments of extreme anguish and agony Yakṣa forgets that it is not an inanimate cloud that he is addressing. He thinks that the cloud also thinks like him and will act as he would like him to. Kālidāsa succeeds eminently in depicting the state of the human mind when a man is so absorbed in himself that the world outside him perhaps does not exist for him. And if at all it exists; it exists for him only. This is why the Yakṣa becoming oblivious of the fact that a cloud is a *jaḍapadārtha*, (an inanimate object) picks it up as his messenger. That is the highest peak of his self-centredness. It was perhaps given to Kālidāsa only, to depict this extreme self-centredness which he depicts in three places in his works. In the *Śākuntala* the innocent Śakuntalā incurs the displeasure of the fierce sage Durvāsas on account of this very extreme self-centredness. Although the sage announces his advent she pays no attention to him. For her the entire world has become Duṣyanta. Similar extreme self-centredness has been depicted by Kālidāsa in his *Kumārasambhava* too. Pārvatī is so devoted to Lord Śiva that for her everything in the forest appears to be Śiva. It was this faculty of describing the extreme self-centredness that won Kālidāsa a name which will ever remain enshrined in the pages of Indian literary history. It is extreme self-centredness of Yakṣa that makes him impart to the cloud all his feelings and emotions. To whatever direction the cloud may move he thinks it is going towards his beloved's place. He gives it a message which it has to convey to the beloved.

The later dūtakāvyas are modelled on the *Meghadūta*. Barring a few, all of them employ birds as messengers. This is perhaps more in line with the earlier Indian tradition. The employment of a *haṁsa* as a *dūta*, in the story of Nala and Damayanti in the *Mahābhārata* perhaps suggested the use of birds as messengers to the poets. Their style, diction or delineation of sentiment owes much to that of the *Meghadūta* but the use of birds as messengers, they owe probably to a much older source. As it happened, each poet tried to employ a different bird to serve as messenger. If one poet employed a *haṁsa*, the second one thought it wise to use a cuckoo or a peacock while the third one employed a *cātaka* or

the fourth one cakora. Thus, it happened that poets went in search of newer and newer birds sometimes even the insects like the bees to serve as messengers. Each one vied with another to convey his message through a different bird. In a way it has been good too. For it has led to greater variety and more charm. If the same birds had been used by the poets to serve as messengers the *dūtakāvyas* would have been a mass of dull and insipid poetry. As they are, they are quite pleasant and charming. This phenomenon has been rather helpful in providing an occasion to poets to exercise their ingenuity too.

Now, a word about those *dūtakāvyas* in which abstract conceptions like morality or *śīla* are treated as messengers. This represents a later phenomenon. In Sanskrit dramas *Prabodhacandrodaya* and a host of other works abstract conceptions like Prabodha, Buddhi, Krodha, Moha etc. occur as characters. We can place *dūtakāvyas* with abstract conceptions in a category where the mind of certain people is highly obsessed with philosophical thoughts. A poet or a dramatist uses abstract conceptions as messengers only to give an expression to his innate love for them. He thinks that by personification they will become more easy and understandable to a common man. That is the approach of any practical philosopher, poet or philosopher-playwright. Generally the philosophical conceptions are too abstruse and abstract for a common man. They are very often beyond his reach. He, therefore, wants to avoid them as far as possible. But for the thinkers and preachers who are out to preach their religion to a common man it becomes imperative to put them in a form that may be acceptable to the common man. In this way they hope to inculcate the highest truths of their religion through the medium of light literature. Most of these *dūtakāvyas* where abstract conceptions are treated as messengers are composed by the Jains. Their aim in choosing the abstract conceptions as messengers appears to be to propagate them and to make the readers acquainted with the broad principles of Jainism. It is a tribute to the ingenuity of the authors that they chose the medium of the *dūtakāvya* which since ages had caught the fancy of the

people of the country. They realised that people would be only too prepared to listen to them and if properly approached, would be converted to their viewpoint, provided an attempt were made through the medium of lyric poetry which so much appealed to them. People in days gone by wanted to sing the Mandākrāntā verses of Kālidāsa and enjoy their lilting melody. Just as they could sing the verses of the *Meghadūta*, they could very well sing the verses of the *Cetodūta* or the *Siladūta* too and consciously or unconsciously imbibe the principles and doctrines enunciated therein. That must have been the idea of the authors of such dūtakāvya. It may also be that these works were composed for the adherents of Jainism to acquaint them more fully with its principles and the doctrines in a language they could understand very well. It is human weakness that people like to read the light literature generally. Dramas, poems, stories and novels appeal to them and if they are used for a particular aim or purpose, that goes right deep into their mind. Bernard Shaw, the playwright and Somerset Maugham, the story-writer through their plays and stories, laid their fingers right at the weak spots of society. Their works, therefore, served their end much more forcefully than any amount of preaching could have done. People generally do not take kindly to preaching. That is why we find stories in the Upaniṣads and Brāhmaṇas called the *arthavādas*. These *arthavādas* serve to highlight a philosophical speculation and make it acceptable to the people much more forcefully than anything else. This is also the basis of stories in the *Mahābhārata* and the *Pāñcatantra*. The reason given is *bālānām sukhobodhāya*. The *bālas*, or the ignorant ones, are generally not able to climb up to the philosophical heights. They are the men of the soil. They can understand only the language of the soil. In the *Meghadūta* Kālidāsa blazed the trail that kept on burning even after many centuries. After the *Meghadūta* there was an outburst of unusual literary activity resulting in the growth of the dūtakāvya literature of considerable magnitude. The sweet music of the *Meghadūta* so inspired the later writers that they tried to sing in the way the great master had done but it is an admitted fact that they could

CC-0. Prof. Sanyal Vaidya Shastri Collection, New Delhi. Digitized by S3 Foundation USA

not measure up to the standards of *Kavikulaguru*. Most of these *dūtakāvyas* were only cheap imitations of Kālidāsa's *Meghadūta*. Some of them were written for an avowed purpose of recapturing the spirit of the *Meghadūta* which unfortunately proved far too elusive. One thing that stands out by the study of the later *dūtakāvyas* literature is that it has pretty little original to offer to the reader. The form and content in later *dūtakāvyas* in more cases than one is borrowed from the *Meghadūta* of Kālidāsa. Six or seven of them are written on the popular style of *samasyāpūrti* where one line from the *Meghadūta* is conjoined with three lines of the poet's own creation. Some of the *dūtakāvyas* are worthwhile while others are poor. The question is: why was it that an element of gradual decay was visible in the *dūtakāvyas* literature? An analysis of the causes that may be responsible for this is interesting as well as illuminating.

One of the reasons for this seems to be Kālidāsa's superiority over other poets. All along the Indian tradition Kālidāsa has been called *Kavikulaguru* or *Kavikulacūdāmaṇi*. He is ranked superior to all other poets of ancient India. The other *dūtakāvyas* that were modelled on his work naturally, therefore, suffered by way of comparison. Some of the *dūtakāvyas* in themselves are not so bad as to be rejected outright by a literary critic, but when compared with Kālidāsa's *Meghadūta* they do not have much appeal.

Had it not been for Kālidāsa, these works would have been ranked as specimens of good poetry worthy of recognition at the hands of scholars and critics. Such, for example, are the *Pavanadūta* and the *Nemidūta*.

The second reason appears to be the decline in the general standards of literary activity in particular periods. On account of a number of factors in particular periods there appears an outburst of unusual activity in all branches of learning, culture and civilization. In England in Shakespeare's time, such an activity appeared. That was called the Renaissance period. On account of progress in all directions that period is known as the golden period of British History. But after Shakespeare for sometime we do not hear of an outstanding man of letters. Poetasters replaced

the poets and imitators followed the original writers. The same thing happened in India too. Kālidāsa's period is known to Indian History as the golden period, for, in it the Indian genius threw up a number of gems, the *Navaratnas*. Kālidāsa was one of them. There was an unusual activity in literature, arts, sciences and medicine. It is no use repeating what is so well-known to history. After the golden period there came a time when tinsel replaced gold. Original activity came almost to a stop and there were very few writers left whose contributions led to the enrichment of literature and philosophy. Take for example, grammar. There we find the age of commentaries appearing after the *Mahābhāṣya* and the *Vākyapadīya*. In Medicine a rehash of Suśruta and Caraka comes on the scene. In Astrology India becomes a *śiṣya* of the Romans and the Greeks and in Mathematics and Sciences the days of the discovery of the zero which revolutionised mathematical studies in ancient days are gone. It is no wonder therefore that the poets coming after the first dūtakāvya do not measure up to the heights of Kālidāsa.

As time rolls on due to political factors the writers become less and less original with the result that some other dūtakāvyas that are found today are not of much use as pieces of literature. Of course we cannot dismiss them as useless as sources of the contemporary history and culture of the country but their literary value does not compel our attention.

This fact, though unfortunate in the extreme, is nevertheless true. It seems the later poetasters—it is a misnomer to call them poets—were so charmed by the *Meghadūta* that they also wanted to try their hand at writing works of the type. This might have served the purpose of satisfying the ego of these poets although some of them at least have very little value so far as poetry is concerned.

The third reason is the unusual influence exercised by the *Meghadūta* on the minds of the later poets which killed their initiative and smothered their originality. The *Meghadūta* was a model for them in style and content and they had to adhere to it. When something becomes a model, it leaves little room for

originality and innovations and without originality and innovations it is very difficult to create a literature of permanent value and abiding interest.

The fourth reason may be the change in the political climate of the country. With the coming into power of the Mohammedans, Sanskrit suffered a definite setback in India. Hitherto the patronage which the Hindu kings had been extending to the authors of Sanskrit encouraged them to continue their literary activities. Now, the Mohammedans, at least some of them, not only opposed Sanskrit but were positively hostile to it. Imbued with the fanatical zeal to propagate Islam these barbarians from Turkey and Mongolia were out to crush and destroy everything that was Hindu. They carried fire and sword wherever they went. With a few noble exceptions they destroyed temples, harassed people and burnt libraries. In such an atmosphere when there were frequent outbursts of killing and incendiarism it was impossible for literature to flourish. Whatever literary activity that went on in the country in spite of the hostility of the paramount power owed its inspiration to the patronage of the Hindu aristocracy which could not be wiped out even by the frequent orgies of violence. Due to this peculiar situation in the country it was not possible for Sanskrit works of great merit to be produced and this partly accounts for the paucity of talent and lack of originality on the part of the writers and poets of Sanskrit that came on the scene. Serious literary activity can only continue when there is peaceful atmosphere all round. In an uncertain atmosphere when there is nobody to recognize or patronize talent, only mediocrities hold the scene.

The fifth reason for the decay of the *dūtakāvya* literature in Sanskrit is the rise of the Prakrits, the Apabhramśas and the modern dialects. This is not to say that no *dūtakāvya* was composed after a particular time, it only means that as the regional languages progressively supplanted Sanskrit, works began to be composed in those languages. Writers began to exercise their poetical ability and express themselves through the medium of these languages. So, those writers also who had the fascination

for composing dūtakāvyas composed them in their respective regional languages and dialects spoken and understood by the people.

So, we can say that there was no change in the desire and inclination of the poets to write dūtakāvyas or poems in which somebody or something had to act as a messenger to convey a message. This had so captivated the minds of the people that there could be no question of the cessation of the dūtakāvyā activity. Their popular appeal persisted. The poets had to cater to the demand of the populace and they did it in their own language. So, the dūtakāvyā activity cannot be said to have suffered a setback in the country. What happened was the change in the vehicle of expression. What formally used to be written in Sanskrit came to be written in the different regional languages. Thus viewed, there was no decay of the dūtakāvyā literature. But so far as dūtakāvyā literature in Sanskrit was concerned, stagnation was slowly visible; gradually the number of dūtakāvyas written in Sanskrit began to fall till we arrive at a time when there remained only a trickle. Dūtakāvyas in Sanskrit are composed even now in India but they are few and far between. Occasionally a Pandit here or there brings out a small poem containing a few scores of *ślokas* to give expression to his poetical ability or to show off his competence in composing verses in Sanskrit. There is practically little originality in the attempt though the charm may be still there. The tradition so far as dūtakāvyas composed in Sanskrit is concerned, stands broken and no amount of occasional or casual efforts of a coterie of scholars of Sanskrit can hope to revive it.

DESCRIPTION OF INDIVIDUAL DŪTAKĀVYAS

Meghadūta of Kālidāsa

Kālidāsa's *Meghadūta* is a widely known love-lyric, having one hundred and ten¹ verses in the Mandākrāntā metre. It has caught popular imagination in Sanskrit. The story goes that Kubera once turned out a certain Yakṣa for one year for neglect of duty. The

Yakṣa took up his abode at Rāmāgiri mountain. On the first day of the month of Āṣāḍha, he saw a cloud on the sky and requested him to convey his message to his beloved consort residing at Alakā.

The poem is divided into two parts, the Pūrva Megha and the Uttara Megha. The former contains the description of the route which the cloud is expected to traverse and the latter contains a vivid description of Alakā, the dreamland of pleasure and the message which the cloud is asked to convey to the Yakṣa's consort.

The richness of Kālidāsa's imagination is revealed in the colourful descriptions of Ujjayinī, the Himālayas and the Kailāsa mountain. His art seems to be natural. The poem contains a graphic description of India's important towns, mountains, cities, rivers, pilgrim-centres etc. It abounds in figures of speech, Utprekṣā, Arthāntaranyāsa, etc., and is written in a very simple and lucid style.

Jaina Meghadūta of Merutuṅga

Most of the dūtakāvya's are unfortunately not dated. This Jaina work, however, is different. It gives welcome information about its date. The author of this poem, Merutuṅga, was born in a village known as Nani in the year 1403 Vikrama era, i.e. 1346 A.D. His original name was Vāstika. He was a great scholar of Sanskrit and Prakrit. He died at the age of 68.

This poem contains 196 verses in all the four cantos. In it the poet has given a description of Neminātha who becomes a recluse. His beloved wife sends him a message inquiring after the condition of the bereaved family.

The work was published by the Jain Atmanand Sabha of Bhavanagar. It appears as Vol. 76 of the said Sabha's publications. It carries a Sanskrit commentary on it by one Śīlaratna which has been edited by Muni Chaturavijaya. It was printed at Nirnaya Sagar Press, Bombay, in 1924.

It is apiece with the Dūtakāvya's written on the model of Kālidāsa's lyric, the *Meghadūta*. Merutuṅga is not the only Jain

writer to make an attempt like this. There are many others like him. The Dūtakāvyas written by other Jain writers are: *Śīladūta* by Cāritrasundaragaṇi, *Pārśvābhyudaya* by Jinasena, *Candradūta* by Meghavijaya, *Indudūta* by Vinayavijayagaṇi, besides *Manodūta* and *Cetodūta* by anonymous writers. While most of the other Dūtakāvyas by Jain writers are written on the *samasyāpūrṭi* style, three lines of the respective author's composition joined on to the fourth line from the *Meghadūta* of Kālidāsa, the *Jaina Meghadūta* is an independent composition. Divided into four cantos it deals with the life of Neminātha when he was a child as also his acts of valour (Canto I), then the season of spring and Neminātha's sports in it (Canto II), next is described Neminātha's marriage and his renunciation of the householder life (Canto III). After this is taken up for description the love-lorn condition of Rājīmatī, Neminātha's wife (Canto IV), who having spotted a cloud in the sky wants to send her message to her beloved husband to woo him back to her (Canto IV, verses 14-37). The friends of Rājīmatī coming to know of this console her and tell her that however she may try her husband who has renounced the world would develop no longing for her. The words also have their effect on her. She no longer feels sad and forsaken. She goes to her husband and gets initiation from him. Like her husband she too secures freedom from worldly attachments and attains self-realization.

Now, a word about the author of the poem: Merutuṅga. Jain history knows two Ācāryas of this name of whom one is known to have some writing work to his credit. One, Merutuṅga, the pupil of Candraprabha, the second Merutuṅga of Añcalagaccha, the pupil of Mahendraprabhasūri. It is the latter who is the author of the present poem. He was born of Naladevī, wife of Vairasiṃha Porwal of the village Nani in the District of Marwar in Rajasthan in Saṃvat 1403. His original name was Vāstika. Once Mahendraprabhasūri of Añcalagaccha happened to visit Nani in the course of his wanderings. Vāstika got the *Dīkṣā* from him. After *Dīkṣā* he came to be known as Merutuṅga. In Saṃvat 1426 he got the title of Sūri at Patan and in Saṃvat 1445 the title of Gacchanāyaka. He died in Saṃvat 1471 at the age of 68. He spent

his long life in social service. In between he also managed to devote himself to literary activity. Including the *Jaina Meghadūta* he is known to have written eight works:

- (i) *Saptaikabhāṣyaṭīkā*
- (ii) *Laghuśatapadī*
- (iii) *Dhātupārāyaṇa*
- (iv) *Śaṣṭdarśanasamuccaya*
- (v) *Bālabodhavyākaraṇa*
- (vi) a commentary on *Bālabodhavyākaraṇa*
- (viii) *Sūrimantrakalpasāroddhāra*

Besides these *Jitakalpasāra* and *Rṣimaṇḍala* etc. are certain other works which too are ascribed to Merutuṅga but whether that Merutuṅga is identical with our author, cannot be proved with any amount of certainty.

The *Jaina Meghadūta* with its 196 verses lacks the spontaneous flow and charm of the *Meghadūta* of Kālidāsa after which it is modelled. The work has a large number of little known words or well-known words used in uncommon meanings. These words have been culled from it and listed below. A collection of these words is obviously very useful for the study of Sanskrit vocabulary. Not only peculiar words, the author not unoften goes in the course of his poem for recondite formations or laboured constructions. Perhaps this was due to the effect of the age in which he was living when poets and writers delighted in the use of obscure forms which would exhibit their knowledge of lexicography and grammar.

An enumeration of the recondite forms would no doubt be interesting but certainly outside the purview of the present study. Hence we restrict ourselves to the enumeration of the little known words or well-known words in little known senses only.

- | | |
|-----------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Adharā | - A lady with a low voice (Hīnavādinī), II, 27. |
| Anantā | - The earth, I, 42. |
| Anabhyāśamityā | - (fem.) Not fit to be approached. |
| Anāśrava | - faultless. (Monier Williams notes its use in A.V.II.3.2. in the sense of not causing pain) II, 38. |

Aṅkūra	- Hair, II, 10.
Aṅkepāli	- Embrace, I. 49.
Aparā	- The hind quarter of an elephant, III. 32.
Apācī	- The Southern quarter, II, 13.
Āsyā	- State of rest, I. 16.
Uccaṇḍa	- Hanging down, II. 7.
Udvaha	- Son, III. 24.
Upayati	- Marriage, I. 31.
Urasa (N)	- Chief, main, III. 20.
Ullalana	- (from <i>ud-lal</i>) Sports, II.44.
Ulūla (dhvani)	- The white(laughter),III. 28.
Ulloca	- An awning, a canopy, III. 26.
Kaṭīra	- Waist, II. 21.
Kamana	- Brahmā, I. 26.
Karṣū	- (i) A ditch of live charcoal. (ii) A river, IV. 29.
Kāṣṭhā	- A deed or action (<i>kriyā</i>), II. 30.
Kīla	- Flame, lambent flame, III, 18.
Kūkada	- (Wrongly written for kukuda) one who gives a girl in marriage with due ceremony and suitable decoration; father-in-law IV. 18.
Kṣattā	- A gate-keeper, a guard, I. 33.
Kṣīrakaṇṭha	- A youngling, an infant, I. 31.
Kṣaireyī	- A dish prepared with milk, IV. 15.
Khaṭī-(patra)	- Chalk, I. 26.
Kharu	- One who is in love with improper or prohibited things only, II. 25.
Garja	- An elephant, II. 38.
Garbhaka	- Two nights (<i>rajanīyuga</i>), II. 41.
Gātra	- The hind quarter of an elephant, II. 40.
Guccha	- A tree, I. 37.
Gūḍhamārga	- Mind, II. 18.
Gundala	- The sound of a small oblong drum (viz., Mardala), II. 44.
Gopati (lit.)	- Earth-lord, a king, II. 33.
Gohira	- Heel, I. 47.
Cari	- An animal. III, 47-48.
Cāra	- A secret place (<i>Gupṭi-grha</i>), III. 44.

Jarṇa	- A tree, II. 10.
Talinatā	- Meagreness, slenderness, contraction, II. 31.
Tāra	- Charming, II. 20.
Tārksyalakṣmā	- Kṛṣṇa, II. 12.
Tūru	- A musical instrument, II. 36.
Tryūṣaṇa	- (Trikaṭu) Ginger, long pepper, small pepper, IV. 29.
Diṣṭa	- Time, II. 1.
Dharma	- A bow, II. 10.
Nagna	- A bard (accompanying an army), II. 6.
Nandimukhī	- Sleep, II. 25.
Nandyāvarta	- A tree, III. 5.
Nāḍī	- A measure of time, half Muhūrta, II. 41.
Nandi	- (<i>Dvādaśavidhatūryanirghoṣa</i>), A sound of twelve kinds of wind pipes, III. 36.
Niṣka	- Gold, II. 3.
Nodya	- Wonder, II. 31.
Pakṣin	- A day with two nights enclosing it, II. 41.
Patrapāla	- A long knife, a dagger, II. 8.
Pākima	- Matured, ripened, II. 38.
Pītala	- Yellow, II. 38.
Pīlu	- An elephant, IV. 18.
Puṇḍarika	- An umbrella, III. 33.
Puruha	- Much, ample, profuse, I. 22.
Peñjūṣa	- Ear, III. 37.
Pauraka	- A garden in the neighbourhood of a city or round a house, II. 9.
Praṇāyya	- Desireless, disapproved or rejected, III. 11.
Pratigha	- Anger, wrath, III. 14.
Babhru	- Kṛṣṇa, II. 38.
Barkara	- Sport, II. 12.
Mattālamba	- A window, III. 37.
Mudira	- Cloud, II. 26.
Meghapuṣpa	- Water(of the cloud), III. 2.
Moca	- The plantain tree, II. 3.
Yāpyayāna	- Palanquin, litter, IV. 3.
Vana	- Dry, II. 38.

Varṇa	- The variegated cloth serving as elephant's quarters, II. 3.
Valaja (neuter)	- Gate, city-gate, III. 40.
Vaśā	- A woman, an elephant, II. 40.
Vasati	- Night, IV. 9.
Vindu	- Acquainted, knowing, II. 20.
Viśvā	- The earth, III. 7.
Vyuṣṭa (Neuter)	- Day-break, II. 26.
Śampā	- Lightning, III. 26.61.
Śampā (kṛtya)	- Levelling, IV. 10.
Sattra	- A wood, forest, IV. 17.
Samjñu	- Knock-kneed, I. 32.
Sic (fem.)	- A garment, III. 4.
Sītya	- Corn or grain, III. 29.
Sumaśara	- Cupid, III. 36.
Sūrata	- Compassionate, kind, IV. 27.
Snātra	- Bath, I. 18.
Stricē	- A vicious or infamous lady or an unfortunate woman, II. 24.
Sthāman	- Strength, I. 22.
Hari	- Wind, I. 20.

Meghābhyudaya (Anonymous)

A fragmentary manuscript of it having 26 verses in different metres has been found recently.² The author and the commentary on it are both anonymous.

Though the colophon of this work is not known and the verses after the 26th are missing, the work may belong to the 18th century.

The poet has composed this work on the model of Kālidāsa's *Meghadūta*. The opening verses are in the Mandākrāntā metre but after the tenth verse we find Sragdharā, Āryā, Upajāti and such like metres. The poet has an intense fondness for alliteration, as for example:

*navāmbuvidyullatayā samantataḥ
tato vimuñcanti samam samantataḥ
vinodayann ambudharā kalāpināḥ
advikṣate candāmasaḥ kalāpināḥ*

The substance of the available part is as under:

The rainy season has approached and the clouds, dark all round, accompanied with lightning have covered the sky. The peacocks and other birds including all the flora and fauna are pleasing everywhere. Everybody is rejoicing and the cool breezes are blowing. A lover is scheduled to go out and the beloved, inspite of her efforts, fails to prevail upon him to change his decision. She is much perplexed. The lover is away and the beloved beguiles her weary hours in a very sorry state till at last she loses her senses.

The messenger seems to be the cloud. The poem is a very nice piece of a love-lyric but unfortunately the complete work is not available. Some words are peculiar to us (for instance *jalāli*). The poet seems to be a Vaiṣṇavite since he writes Rāma, Rāma, etc. at the end of every verse.

Meghadautyam of Trailokyamohana Guhaniyogī

The poem was composed about fifty years back. It consists of two hundred stanzas in the Mandākrāntā metre.

The language of the poem is very simple. The subject matter is similar to that of the *Meghadūta*. In form too, it has similarity with it, with the difference that in this *dūtakāvya* the beloved sends the message to the lover.

The story goes like this: A Yakṣī receives the message from her lover and responds to it. She wants to convey her feelings and emotions and gives them a clear expression.

A large number of verses are close imitation of the *Meghadūta* of Kālidāsa. The poet seems to have good knowledge of rhetorics and prosody. This *virahakāvya* is one of the biggest works found in the *dūtakāvya* literature. The poet has no thorough mastery over Sanskrit grammar and has deliberately put in obscure words to display his skill in poetry.

Pārśvābhyudaya of Jinasena

It is divided in four cantos. There are three hundred and sixty four verses in all in this poem: one hundred and eighteen in the

first, the same number in the second, fifty-seven in the third, and seventy-one in the fourth. Due to its having been written on the *Samasyāpūrti* scheme the whole poem has been composed in the *Mandākrāntā* metre except the last six verses of the fourth canto where five verses are in *Mālinī* and the remaining one in the *Vasantatilakā*. The poem imitates the *Meghadūta* in every respect with this difference that at places the dull and the drab descriptions impede the flow of the work.

There need be no controversy about the date of the author of this work which was composed, as has been expressly stated by the author himself, during the reign of Amoghavarṣa I of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa dynasty. The following two verses of the poem may be quoted here with advantage:

*iti viracitam etat kāvyam āveṣṭya megham
bahugunam apadoṣam kālīdāsasya kāvyam
malinitaparakāvyam tiṣṭhad evāśaśāṅkam
bhuvanam avatu devaḥ sarvadāmoghavarṣaḥ ॥*
*śrīvīrasenamunipādapayobjabhṛṅgaḥ
śrīmān abhud vinayasenamunir garīyān
taccoditena jinasenamuniśvareṇa
kāvyam vyadhāyi pariveṣṭitameghadūtam ॥*

Amoghavarṣa is believed to have ascended the throne in Śaka 736 and continued to rule till Śaka 799. The theme of the work is as under:

There is one Kamaṭha who having been expelled by King Aravinda goes to the bank of the river Sindhu to practice penance. When Marubhūti, (Pārśvanātha), the younger brother of Kamaṭha learns this he comes to him (Kamaṭha). When Kamaṭha, sees Marubhūti he is at once reminded of the past hostilities and thinks of killing him. On account of his Māyā he brings forth rains, roars like a lion and rails at Marubhūti. When he finds that all this has left Marubhūti cold, he invites him for a duel and advises him to go to Alakāpurī when he would meet his doom at his hands. He further advises him to assume the form of a cloud after his death, to go to Alakā passing on the way from Rāmagiri, wherefrom the

journey would begin, to Āmrakūṭa mountain, the Daśārṇa country with its capital at Vidiśā, the rivers Nirvindhya and Sindhu, the city of Ujjayinī where it (the cloud) is advised to see the Jaina temples, the river Gambhīrā, the mountain Devagiri, the river Carmaṇvatī, the city of Daśapura and the river Sitā, the region of Brahmāvarta, Kurukṣetra, the sacred places of Balarāma in its vicinity and the Kanakhala mountain which will usher him to Alakā. The poet's description of Alakā is really charming. Equally charming is the description of the union of Vasundharā, the wife of Marubhūti in an earlier birth with her husband (Marubhūti). The whole scene is highly pathetic and emotional.

As Kamaṭha has been saying all this Marubhūti (Pārśvanātha) maintains his calm. At that Kamaṭha again challenges him for fight but that too leaves Marubhūti cold. Then Kamaṭha creates a bevy of young girls on account of his Māyā. They approach Marubhūti singing and dancing, but Marubhūti remains unaffected. All his efforts gone in vain, Kamaṭha feels highly insulted. He lifts up a rock and when he is about to strike Marubhūti's head with it, a Nāga king Dharaṇīndra accompanied by his wife comes there. On seeing him Kamaṭha takes to flight but Nāgarāja prevents him from doing so, offers him *abhaya*, reminds him of all his evil deeds in previous births and prays to God to have mercy on him (Kamaṭha). And then he spreads an umbrella of his hoods on the head of Marubhūti who is none else than Lord Pārśvanātha himself. The wife of Nāgarāja too does likewise. At this Kamaṭha feels penitent and asks for forgiveness for all his earlier crimes. When he is praying there flows forth a stream of tears from his eyes. At this sight the gods shower flowers from the heaven, and the *duṇḍubhis* are sounded. The gods come from the heaven to Pārśvanātha. The *tāpasas* too come to him. At this the story of the *kāvya* comes to an end.

Pavanadūta of Dhoyi

It is the oldest available work barring the *Meghadūta*, *Ghaṭakarparakāvya* and *Candradūta* of Jambūkavi. The poem contains 104 verses in Mandākṛāntā metre.

The *Pavanadūta* of Dhoyi has been published in Sanskrit *Sahitya Parishad Series*, as work No. 11 and has been very ably edited by Chintaharan Chakravarti with a detailed introduction in English, covering as many as 26 pages from which we learn much about the poet. According to Chakravarti Dhūyi, Dhoyi, Dhoi or Dhoyika as the poet is variously called belonged to the court of King Lakṣmaṇasena of Bengal of the 12th century A.D. He was known to have been one of the five jewels of Lakṣmaṇasena's court. The verse which enumerates the names of these five jewels does not specifically mention Dhoyi but mentions one *Kavirāja* who has been conclusively proved by Chakravarti to be no other than the poet Dhoyi who more than once in his *Pavanadūta* refers to himself as *kavikṣmābhṛtām cakravartī*³ and *kavinarapati*⁴. The colophon of the work also reads *iti śrīdhoyikavirājaviracitam*. As has been said above, King Lakṣmaṇasena belonged to the 12th century A.D. So Dhoyi must have flourished in that century. The upper limit of the poet is furnished by the discovery of the verses attributed to him which begin to appear in works like *Saduktikarṇāmṛta* (1205 A.D.); Jalhana's *Subhāṣitamuktāvalī* (middle of the 13th century) and the *Śārṅgadharapaddhati* (14th century).

The poet has selected a historical character as the hero of his work. It is said that once Lakṣmaṇasena invaded and conquered Malayācaladeśa. During his campaign a Gandharva girl of Kanakapurī was fascinated by his beauty, although she could not disclose her feelings to him. After a few days' stay the king left the place and the heroine became sad. She then sent the wind as messenger to convey her feelings to the king residing at his capital Vijayapuram in Bengal.

The poet depicted a nice picture of the heroine who is in a very sad condition. The poem has won for him a name. It is a fact that very few poems can excel it or even equal it.

Pavanadūta of Vādicandra

This poem is written by Vādicandra. The colophon gives the name of his Guru as Santinātha. It consists of one hundred and

one stanzas in the Mandākrāntā metre. It does not follow the usual style of the dūtakāvya, as there is no mention of the route. Nor has it any of the attractions of a lyric-poem. The theme of the poem is:

Tārā, the wife of a king named Vijaya has been abducted by another king whom the poet calls by the name Khecara or Khagapati. The lover while thinking of her beloved's talents bursts into tears and requests the wind to convey his message to her. Thereafter, he tells it (the wind) the charms of the journey although the names of the places *en route* are not given. The wind is to pass through the woods, the mountains, the rivers, etc. The wind is requested not to put off the lamps at the moment when Khecaras are busy in their sexual merry-making, for they would like to see the naked bodies of their consorts⁵. The lover is busy in brooding over the departure till at last the wind reaches the beloved who is busy in meditation of Jineśa.

The wind reaches the abductor too. Then there are a few verses put into the mouth of the wind which are of didactic nature. The wind informs the king that the consequences of abducting another's wife are not good. The mother of the abducting king intervenes just when he is trying to make preparations for a combat, and at her instance the abducted Tārā is handed over to the wind who brings her back to the lover.

Vāṭadūta of Kṛṣṇanātha

This poem of one hundred verses is written by Kṛṣṇanātha Pañcānana who is said to have flourished during the last century.

The subject-matter of this work is Sītā's abduction; the same as mentioned by Vālmīki in his *Rāmāyaṇa*. The story of the poem in brief is that Sītā who has been abducted by Rāvaṇa, feels very sad and requests the wind to convey her message to Rāma.

The style of the poem is as attractive as that of the *Padmadūta*.

In the first part the poet describes the sad condition of Sītā. After this there is the description of the route to be followed. Thereafter comes the description of Rāma's Āśrama. Then are

described a number of things such as Sītā's friends, Muni Āśrama, sunrise, sunset, Rāma's condition in Sītā's absence, her message to Rāma, benedictions, prayers, etc.

Aniladūta of Rāma Dayālu Tarkaratna

This poem has been composed by Rāmadayālu of Bhaṭṭapālī who was patronized by the king of Vardhamāna state. The work has not been published so far.

The theme of the poem is the same as that of the other dūtakāvyaś concerned with Kṛṣṇa's and Gopīs' love-affairs. The messenger is wind, i.e. *anila*, which is requested by the Gopīs to convey their feelings to Kṛṣṇa who is requested to come back from Madhupura to Vṛndāvana.

Maruddūta of R.C. Śānta Śālihāsa

The latest of the dūtakāvyaś of this category is the *Maruddūta* by Rameśacandra Śānta Śālihāsa. It is published serially in the *Divya-Jyotiḥ*, a Sanskrit monthly from Simla; the last instalment having been published in its issue of November, 1961. It is a small poem of not much literary merit, and abounding in grammatical and other errors. It is a poor attempt and does little credit to the author. The theme of the work is:

A follower of Mahātmā Gandhi is put in a prison. After he has been there for sometime, he feels a longing for his wife and son, who are in Indraprastha, the old name for Delhi. The prisoner in these moments experiences the sweet touch of the Malaya breeze from a small opening in his cell and eagerly asks it to convey his message to his kith and kin who are living far away in Delhi. The breeze is to start from somewhere in Eastern India where the man is made to live in confinement during the British days and pass in its long journey through Vārāṇasī, Prayāga (Allahabad), and Kanpur from where it is to take a turn to Āgrā to have a look at the famous Taj. From Āgrā it is to proceed to Delhi. At this the poem comes to an end. The message is not described. May be, it is to be taken up in the coming issue or issues but there is no indication to the effect in the November

issue of the Magazine which in its previous issues carried the note 'to be continued'. In the course of the description of the journey the poet describes in vivid detail the famous cities and towns that fall on the way, Vārāṇasī, Prayāga etc. with all that is worth seeing in them. Here and there, there are poetic flashes, too, but their charm is very much marred by the inadequacy of expression and faulty idioms, which are unfortunately not a few in the poem.

Indudūta of Vinayavijayagaṇi

Vinayavijayagaṇi, a Jain poet has composed this work consisting of 131 verses in the Mandākrāntā metre after the usual pattern of the dūtakāvyas. The theme of this work is:

Vinayavijayagaṇi, a native of Dvādaśāvarta, has observed celibacy and is absorbed in meditations in the benign company of his gracious teacher residing at a pilgrim-centre named Yodhapura. After the usual evening prayers the poet is just out to pay his homage at the sacred feet of his Guru but all of a sudden he goes to sleep and enters a dreamland. He looks at the rising moon and entreats him to convey his message to his revered teacher. He praises the high family of the Moon; her pedigree showing her relation with Lakṣmī and other gods. Then he relates the route from Yodhapura to Surat. It is in the last verse only that he states his message. It is a request to the effect that the venerable teacher whom he is worshipping constantly may remain kind and considerate to him so that he may continue to follow his path and gain emancipation.

It is a nice little poem and makes a delightful reading. It is rich in fine figures of speech. The flight of imagination displayed is commendable. The predominant note in it is that of tranquillity and not Karuṇa (Pathos) which is a common characteristic of the dūtakāvyas.

The work was published in the 14th volume in the Kāvya-mālā series. The text of the poem is highly corrupt. From an editorial note on page 45, Footnote I, we come to know the reason of it. The editor says that only one manuscript of it could be found and that too was corrupt and broken at many places. It is unfortunate that the editor

has done nothing to improve upon the text or to fill in the lacunae, with the result that the verses at many places have lost in clarity of meaning and have become quite unintelligible. Centuries of careless handling of the work has so thoroughly corrupted its text that it becomes impossible many times to arrive at the hypothetical original, however, ingeniously one may try to do it.

The colophon of *Indudūta* says that it is an imitation of *Meghadūta*—*Meghadūta-chāyā-kāvya*. From this it is clear that the author composed it in imitation of Kālidāsa's *Meghadūta*. But even a cursory perusal of it shows that it is an unsuccessful attempt altogether. Excepting of course the Mandākrāntā metre and a few expressions here and there the work has very little similarity with the original whose imitation it claims to be. The text of the book, as available in the Kāvya-mālā series, is broken at many places, and even where it is not, it is highly corrupt. But apart from it, the value of the work as a literary piece is not very high. The poet in keeping with the later poets many times overstretchers himself. His language at places suffers from unnecessary paddings, as for example, in verses 27 and 50.

The poem does not have uniformity in style. It suffers from jerks. Generally verses are without a charm but occasionally after a few verses there occurs a flash when the poet gives us an original *Utprekṣā* or *Upamā*, as for example, in verse 24 where he imagines that the moon is pale like a withered leaf because it is separated from its beloved, the night. In the day time the moon is seen to be grey in colour and this greyness the poet imagines to be due to the sorrow that the moon may be feeling on account of being separated from its beloved, the night. Now this is a very happy idea. The poet has used here an *ayonija upamā*. In verse 65, Abhramatī is shown pleased to see her son, the moon. The mushroom growth of reeds on her banks are her hair standing on end, surging waves are her hands raised to clasp her son. Now this is another nice *Utprekṣā*. At another place the author gives us a nice instance of *Hetūtprekṣā* (verse 9). Maidens generally are jealous by nature but they feel ashamed when they see other

maidens' superior talents. This was precisely the reason why Laṅkā drowned herself in the vast ocean when she saw the glittering beauty of Vātāpādri. The Vasvaukasārā went out of sight and the Bhagavatī concealed herself in Pātāla. The poet is fond of alliteration also, as for example—*pañca pañcān* (verse 22), *māravīṇām navīnām* (V. 64), *vīcihastair udastaiḥ* (V.65), *keli-līlāvilolān* (V.67), *nāvyānīrā gabhīrā* (V. 83) and *kāntāḥ vanāntāḥ* (V.90). He used Yamaka also, e.g., *narmadā narmadormi* in V.83, but in his effort for it he does not pay proper attention to meaning. In the above quotation, for example, the meaning of the word *narma* is taken to be happiness. Narmadā should, therefore, be that (river) whose waves give happiness. but the original meaning of the word Narmadā is *priyālāpā*. That his Yamaka suffers from such a looseness of meaning is illustrated by another example in V.92. It is *sumanaḥ-saṁvitānām latānām*. Here the poet takes the meaning of the word *saṁvitāna* as 'full of' but actually it should mean 'spread out'. Similarly, in verse 112 the author uses the expression *brahmasabrahma* etc. Here the additional *sa* is useless. It should be *brahmābrahmarūpam*. Occasionally the poet writes verses where he uses expressions such as *kāntam ekāntakāntam*, which are of course sweet and suit the occasion. Generally the work suffers from scribal errors besides other discrepancies which are being discussed as under:

In verse 2, line 3, the author says *vinaya-vinataḥ*, i.e. *vinayena vinataḥ*. Both of these have the same sense and either of the two could suffice. It is an example of *adhiḥkapatva*. In verse 3. line 1, the word *śikara* should be read as *śikhara*. The word *śikara* gives no sense, nor can the word *śikara* be supposed here for that would infringe the metre. In the last line the author has mentioned *pañcakūṭa* mountain afterwards but the pronoun *yatra* preceding it in the second line creates a doubt and is an example of *Vidheyāvimarśadoṣa*, i.e. non-discrimination of the predicate.

Again in verse 5, line 1, *krīḍopavanapadavī* should be separate from *krīḍatām*. In the text it is jumbled up and obscures the sense. In separating the two the prose order becomes clear. *Krīḍopavanapadavī* is the agent (*Kartā*) and is connected with

the verb *āviṣkaroti*. The *vātoddhūta*etc. are the winds compared with the symphony of the citizens which cause the peacocks to dance. This has been mentioned together with the humming of the black bees. The correct formation would have been *dhvanadvāditrahṛdyān nṛtyatkekiprakarasubhagān*.

In verse 9, line 1, in *purama*, the syllable *pu* should be read as *pa*. This should be *parama* as that alone makes sense. The reading in the text *puramagurudhyānasandhānālinasvāntaḥ* is also otherwise faulty, *sandhāna* being redundant. Again in the second line in *kāntam tam iti rajaneḥ* the author has used *iti* between *kāntam* and *rajaneḥ* which splits both the words and is, therefore, misplaced. Viśvanātha, the author of the *Sāhityadarpaṇa* has given a list of such usages and syntactical irregularities in his work.

In the first line in *dr̥ṣtvā cainam* in V. 9 the author uses the pronoun *enam* (accusative from *etad*) which is followed by *tam* in the second line. Here the pronoun *adas* (*aṁum*) should have been used; otherwise, it is also a case of *Bhagnaprakramatā*.

The word *sadyaḥ* and *drāk* in the second hemistich of the same verse are synonyms; any one of the two would have been sufficient.

In verse 16, line 4, the first syllable is missing, it is... *totpatu*. It may be *cintotpattau* meaning 'on the rise of anxiety'. In line 3 of the same verse *cittavṛttīm* should be read as *cittavṛttih*, it being the subject. It should be in the nominative and not in the accusative case.

In verse 18, line 4, the word *prānyāḥ* should be changed into *prāṇinaḥ*. But it would infringe the metre. If it remains *prānyāḥ*, it would be grammatically wrong. The better reading may be *prāyaḥ santaḥ*...etc.

In verse 20, line 3, the particle *ca* after *aśvam* is unnecessary for, *ca* is a conjunctive particle. There is nothing which it may conjoin or connect.

Similarly, in verse 21, line 1, the *ca* after *kautukī* is useless as it connects *yautake* with *kautukī* which makes no sense. If we replace it by the word *san* the sense will be clearer.

In verse 24, line 1, the word *varghayati* should be *vardhayati*. This is evidently a scribal error or a printing mistake.

In verse 28, line 3, *jagadvyāpi* should be combined with *saurypratāpaḥ* to make the sense clear. It is this which pervades the whole universe.

In verse 33, line 2, the word *indindira* is used in the sense of a large bee, which is very rare.

In verse 34, line 2, *kṛidāvāpī* should be joined with *savanasa-rasaiḥ* to make the sense clear. It would mean the winds which have become cool with a bath in the pleasure-lake. In line 4, of the same verse *stāt* should be read as *syāt*. It is evidently a mistake.

In verse 35, line 1, the reading *antimajinavarāḥ* is wrong. If we connect it with *Yama...* etc. then too it makes no sense. In case we read it as *Jinavarān* it will qualify the *prāsādān* in the second line. The sense will thus become a bit clearer.

In verse 37, line 2, *visarga* should be added to the word *vimānā*. It is the plural of the word *vimāna* that is meant here and not the feminine of the word *vimānā* meaning *vigato māno yasyāḥ*.

In verse 38, line 3, the word *kṛti* in *abhisṛtikṛtikṛtām* is superfluous. The editor has put an asterisk mark here. The expression appears to him to be quite puzzling. We can suggest here a conjectural emendation. According to us the whole line may be recast as *vighno yat syād abhisṛtikṛtām yoṣitām ca tvadīyaiḥ*. There does not remain any superfluous word then.

In the final line of the same verse *dūranirvāsitaḥ* should be *dūranirvāsitaḥ* and *syāt* should be *syāḥ*. This emendation would eminently suit the context.

In verse 40, line 3, the reading *kṣaṇam iyam api* should be changed into *kṣaṇam ayam api* for, it is connected with *parisara*, which is in the masculine. *Prekṣaṇīya* should be read as *prekṣaṇīyaḥ*. In the extant reading the masculine *parisara* is followed by a pronoun in the feminine which is evidently wrong.

In verse 42, line 1, *vicariṣyatya vaśyam* should be read as *vicariṣyasya vaśyam* as it is connected with *tvam*.

In verse 43, line 2, *kāryasiddhe nidānam* should be *kārya-siddher nidānam* as it is in construction with the word *vacanam*. If it has to be justified—*sthitasya gatiś cintanīyā*, it may be taken as a vocative and may be dissolved as *svīkṛtanijasuhṛdaḥ kāryasya siddhir yena sa svīkṛtanijasuhṛtkāryasiddhiḥ*, i.e. who has taken the responsibility for the success of his dear friend.

In verse 45, line 4, *udghātanaiḥ* should be read as *udghātanaiḥ*. Or it may be author's own reading in the sense of *utkṣepaṇa*.

In verse 49, line 3, the word *vaya* seems to have confounded the editor; for, he has put a question mark after that. *Vaya* is *varya*. The top mark for 'r' might have been omitted in the original manuscript. This conjecture also gets support from the close proximity of *varya* with *vaidūrya*. Here the author seems to be aiming at a nice alliterative effect.

In verse 51, line 4, *svam* should be *sva*. Again, the word *bahalavidapi* should be replaced by the word *bahalaviṭapi*. Here *da* for *ṭa* may be a scribal error or a printing mistake.

In verse 52, line 3, the text is broken. If we supply the word *khara*, the lacuna can be filled up. This is supported by the context also. After the dots indicating the break in the text we have the word *karah*. Before the dots we have *uṣṇāmsor api*. If *khara* is supplied we would have the complete expression *uṣṇāmsor api kharatarakarāḥ* meaning 'scorching rays of the sun.' This will also be in keeping with the author's love for alliteration which is so evident in the work.

In verse 55, line 2, the author has used the word *ripusurajitā*. Due to scribal error or some other reason the order of the words has been inverted. The reading should have been *suraripujitā*.

In verse 57, line 1, *eṣām* should be *asya* for, according to context it refers to the moon. *Eṣām* cannot refer to *prāsādānām* in the previous verse, for, pronouns refer to words which are used in close proximity to them: *sarvanāmnām sannihita-parāmarśitvam*. Now, even if this *nyāya* is not taken into consideration or its application in all cases is not conceded, the word *eṣām* cannot be connected with *prāsādānām* in the previous

verse, for, there the complete expression is *prāsādānām trikam* which is in the singular. *Eṣām*, therefore, is indefensible. It should be definitely replaced by *asya*. Although grammatically this emendation may be right yet it cannot be easily fitted into the metre for the final syllable then will remain short, *laghu*, which in the first *pāda* is generally considered to be a fault.

In verse 58, line 3, the editor has put a question mark after the word *kaṭukamatinām*. The word *kaṭuka* of course confuses one on account of its being used in a less known sense and again on account of its close resemblance with the word *kaṭu* meaning 'sour'. Here, however, the word does not mean 'sour'. It means 'pungent', 'sharp'. *Kaṭukamatinā*, therefore, means 'by the sharpwitted'.

In verse 60, line 2 breaks after the word *gantum ūrdhvam*. The lacuna may be filled by supplying the word *sudūram*, meaning thereby that the palace intends to go very high in the sky.

In verse 61, line 1 is found broken after *adri*. The lacuna may be filled by supplying the word *ḍṛḍhām* as it is connected with the word *puṣṭim*. The *anvaya* will then be *etāḥ ḍṛḍhām puṣṭim dadhatu*. The expression agrees perfectly with the sense. In line 3 of the same verse *sya* may be added to *auśadhīśa* to fill up the lacuna.

In verse 62, line 2, *mithyānubhāvām* should be *mithyānubhāvā* for, it is connected with *tīrtharājī*, which is in the nominative singular. The whole of the second line is a compound qualifying the word *tīrtharājī* of the first line.

In verse 63, line 2, the word *dr̥ṣṭā* should be changed into *draṣṭā* for, it is connected with the word *janah*. There is no other word with which it can be connected. *Dr̥ṣṭā* is evidently a scribal error for *draṣṭā*.

In verse 67, line 1 is broken after *akhila* and the next word after the break is *rajanān*. If we supply the syllable *pu* to fill up the lacuna, the expression will be *prīṇāty eṣākhilapurajanān* meaning that it pleases all the inhabitants of the city by giving them its pure water. In line 4 of the same verse the reading

neyagādānagaryāḥ is puzzling. The editor also has put a question mark there. Even in spite of our very best efforts it has not been possible to hit upon the correct reading in this case. The word *punīte* in line 3 of the same verse should be read as *punītaiḥ* as it is connected with *vīcīhastaiḥ* in the instrumental plural.

In verse 68, line 3, the word *upanayaiḥ* should be changed to *upanayeh*, otherwise, the sentence would be left without a verb and the meaning would also suffer. The author wants to say 'do not trouble the separated persons with your unbearably sharp rays' and for this purpose the construction should be *pādaiḥ mā sma upanayeh*. In the same line the word *prasahyaiḥ*, which from the text as handed down to us appears to be connected with *upanayaiḥ*, is nothing but a scribal error. It ought to be *asahyaiḥ*.

In verse 74, line 3, the text is broken towards the beginning. If we supply *gra* to fill up the lacuna the complete word will be *grāmaikaikam* meaning 'each and every village'. This very well fits in the context and makes the sense perfectly clear.

In verse 75, line 1, again the text is broken. If we supply the syllable *gu* the complete word will be *pratipadagurūn* which will fit in well with the context.

In verse 79, line 1, *śamanakakubhiḥ* should be changed into *śamanakakubham* for that alone makes sense. The sentence is *tasmād draṅgāc chamanakakubham prasthitasyāntarā te*, when you go to the southern direction from that city. Not only should the instrumental case be avoided with the word *kakubh* when it is connected with the word *prasthitasya*, the plural in *śamanakakubhiḥ* also is unjustified for, Śamana's or Yama's quarter is one and not many. The correct instrumental plural would, however, be *kakubbhiḥ* which militates against the metre.

In verse 82, line 1, *prauḍhadurgām* which qualifies *Bhrgupuram* should evidently be *prauḍhadurgam*.

In verse 88, line 4, the word *nejadopi* should be changed into *no jadopi* for, that only makes sense. The whole line would then be *pitroḥ paśyan ka iha suratam lajjate no jadopi* meaning 'what fool in this world would not be ashamed when he sees his parent sexually united?'

In verse 91, line 4, the reading is altogether missing. We may conjecturally reconstruct it as; *preṅkhacchākhām anilataralocchūnabhaṅgībhīr urvīm*’.

In verse 92, line 2, the reading is *vividhasumanah saṁvitānām latānām*. Here, the word *saṁvitānām* is a big problem. If it is taken to be in the sense of a canopy of flowers a great difficulty would arise for, in the genitive plural the form would be *saṁvitānānām*. If the word *saṁvīta* in the sense of ‘surrounded by’ or ‘full of’ is taken then the metre would be infringed. The only alternative left to us is to suggest such a word in place of it as may not be far removed from the form of the present word and at the same time may yield an appropriate sense. *Samcitānām* is one such word. The complete reading then would be *vividhasumanahsamcitānām latānām* meaning ‘creepers laden with a large variety of flowers’. This is a case of confusion of *ca* and *va*, which are so similar in form.

In verse 95, line 3, *nihitā meru* should be changed into *nihito meru*.

In verse 96 line 1, the word *nīlacchāyām* should be *nīlacchāyam* for, it qualifies the word *puram*. In the second line a similar word is used *śubhracchāyam*. This is perfectly correct. In line 3 of the same verse the word *piṅge* should be changed into *piṅgaiḥ* for, it qualifies *ikṣudaṇḍaiḥ*. The reading evidently should have been *piṅgaiś caṅgaiḥ* meaning ‘yellow coloured (i.e. ripened)’ and of a superior quality. *Caṅga* is a Prakrit word. It may be that the poet originally read *piṅgair aṅgaiḥ*.

In the second line *vismṛtaiḥ* should be changed into *vistṛtaiḥ* as that alone makes sense.

In verse 97, line 3 is broken. The particle *su* would serve well to fill up the lacuna. The word then will be *surajah*.

In verse 98, line 4, the word *kṣaudre* is confusing. The word *kṣaudra* means honey. Here, it has the unusual sense of *kṣudraiḥ kṛtaḥ*, ‘performed by the mean’.

In verse 103, line 1, the text breaks after *cārtha pau*. If we add *rān* to *pau* we would have the complete reading *cārthapaurān*. In *cārtha* the ‘r’ is superfluous. The proper word should be *cātha*. It means ‘and also’. The meaning of the whole

line would now be as follows: You will see the people mounted on elephants, horses, and also the other citizens. The emended text thus suits the context eminently.

In verse 105, line 2 *Sudharmyā* of Indra is mentioned. It should be changed to *Sudharmā* for, that is the word for an assembly hall of the gods. *Sudharmyā* is, therefore, incorrect.

In verse 106, line 2, the *sakhayati* is probably a mis-print for *sukhayati*.

In verse 107, line 4, the *anusvāra* should be added to the word *lakṣmī* for, it is to be connected with the word *nidadhataḥ*. In verse 110, line 1, the word *kāṭhina* is evidently wrong. It should be *kāṭhina*. The third line of the same verse is broken. The lacuna may be filled up by adding *śyā* to *mā* meaning 'light blue coloured'. The word *dyati* is evidently a mis-print for *dyuti*. Line 4, of the same verse is again broken in the end after *bahi*. The lacuna may be filled up by adding *śca*.

In verse 111, line 1, the word *asiti* should be read as *asita* for, there is no word *asiti* as such. It qualifies the word *śmaśru*. The meaning is 'dark moustaches'. In the same line the *kūrcāṅkurodyān* is evidently wrong. It should be *°rādyān*. In the same verse lines 3 to 4, are *vaidrumīm akṣamālām rāgaṁ prāptām iva guruguṇair ghūrṇamānām ca citre*. Here, the word should be *citram*; the garland of pearl-beads cannot evidently rotate in an image. Or *citre* may go with *anike* in the next verse.

In line 3 of verse 113, *arhan* should be *arhān* for, it is connected with the word *lokān*.

In verse 115, line 1, in the word *namad asumatām* the genitive is used for the dative, which runs counter to Sanskrit usage.

In verse 117, line 1, the word *jāpa* has been used. It is a solecism. The correct form is *japa*. In verse 120, line 4, the word *sampadi* should be *saṁsadi*. The construction of the sentence would then be *surāṇām saṁsadi indram* etc.

In verse 130, line 2, the word *manāstvena* should be *manastvena*. In the same verse line 3, the text is broken after *sampraty ahani*. After this word there is only one letter *śi*. Possibly *ni* is missing. The original reading might have been *sampraty ahani niśi vā*. It is logical that *niśi* should follow *ahani*.

Finally, it may be remarked that inspite of our very best efforts, there is still one verse where a reading is enigmatic. In verse 99, line 3, the reading is *kuṭrāpyādyādyaraka janitāḥ*. It is a puzzle. The editor has also put a question mark here.

Candradūta of Śrīkṛṣṇa Tarkālaṅkāra

This small dūtakāvya is attributed to Śrīkṛṣṇa Tarkālaṅkāra. He was a great logician. He is said to be the son of Gopīkānta Bhaṭṭācārya who commented on the *Kāvyaaprakāśa*. The poet's intention is to propagate his doctrines or philosophy through the medium of the light literature.

The poem shows close similarity with the *Padāṅkadūta* where the poet is more interested in philosophical speculation through a poem.

From the Mālyavat Parvata, Rāma sends Hanumat to Laṅkā. He comes back after seeing Sītā. Rāma is very sad because of Sītā's separation. In a state of awful bewilderment he espies the rising moon who is moving towards Laṅkā and asks her to convey his message to Sītā.

Candradūta of Vinayaprabhu

The work contains only 12 verses. The first eleven verses are in Varṇasasthavila metre and the last one is in Anuṣṭubh. The theme of this work is that a lady separated from her lover sends a message to him through the moon. The moon is requested to inform the hero that his beloved is dying by inches.

The moon is moved by her piteous condition and bewilderment. She relates the sad plight of the lady to her lover who being charmed by the melodious voice of the moon comes back and thus the couple enjoys a happy reunion.

The poem is really a nice piece where the messenger not only relates the message but actually brings about the desired end.

Candradūta of Jambūkavi

The poet flourished in the 10th century. This small poem contains only 23 verses in the Mālinī metre. The work though

small, can be placed among some of the master-pieces of the dūtakāvyā literature. The work is also useful for the history of India for it gives chronology of a certain period. Most of the verses are Yamakas of a subtle nature. A large number of scholars or rhetoricians quote these verses in their works.

The theme of the poem is the conventional one peculiar to the dūtakāvyas. A lady separated from her lover requests the moon to go to her lover and inform him of the pangs of separation she is suffering from his absence. The moon is asked by the lover kindly to go back and enjoy her sweet company.

Pikadūta of Rudra Nyāyapañcānana

Only a fragmentary copy of it having about 30 verses is available. The metre used is Śārdūlavikrīḍita.

As in the *Ghaṭakarpāra-Yamaka-Kāvya* and in some other dūtakāvyas, so in this poem also the messenger is sent by the beloved to the lover.

The tradition of describing the route to be followed by the dūta is missing in this poem. The story in brief runs thus:

Kṛṣṇa has left for Mathurā. Vṛndāvana is no place of attraction to Rādhā. It is simply repelling and fortunately for Rādhā a cuckoo happens to pass nearby. She humbly requests it to convey her message to her lover. She does not like to send a beetle as it would surely cling to Kṛṣṇa's lotus-like feet, since it is in the nature of the beetles to run after the lotus-flowers. The beetle would surely fail to convey the message and come back again. Earlier Rādhā had sent her mind to Kṛṣṇa but it did not come back. The cuckoo is asked by the Gopīs to ride on an elephant and go to Mathurā. After all, what offence have the Gopīs given to Kṛṣṇa that he has entirely forgotten them? The cuckoo would tell him that his votareesses can no longer resist the pangs of his separation. Nevertheless, they sustain themselves in the hope of reunion with him. The trees and the birds etc. of Vṛndāvana are all sad in his absence. The cuckoo is to request Kṛṣṇa to give cheer to the Gopīs and to come back to

Mathurā.

Pikadūta of Ambikācaraṇa Devaśarmā

This poem is attributed to Ambikācaraṇa Devaśarmā who seems to be a poet of the present century. This poem has not been published so far.

The message and the theme of this work coincide with that of the *Aniladūta* of Rāma Dayālu Tarkaratna.

Kokiladūta of Haridāsa

This kāvya of one hundred and three verses is attributed to Haridāsa (or Harimohana) who composed it in the Śaka era 1777. One hundred verses of it are concerned with message proper while the last three verses disclose the poet's own identity.

The theme of this work is that Kṛṣṇa has left Vṛndāvana. Rādhā is much aggrieved. She wants to convey her feelings through a *kokila*. The rest of the matter is an imitation of the dūtakāvyas of this type.

There is no mention of the route. The poet wrote the work to show off his poetical talents. The verses are at times too difficult and abstruse and thus much of the charm of the poem is lost.

Kokilasandeśa of Veṅkaṭācārya

It is different from the *Kokilasandeśa* of Uddaṇḍa Kavi. The poem has 741 verses on the model of Kālidāsa's *Meghadūta* having 60 and 61 verses in the Mandākrāntā metre in the first and second parts respectively. The manuscript of the work is preserved in the T. M. S. S. M. Library, Tanjore. The theme of the work is:

Having enjoyed the company of sixteen thousand consorts, Viṣṇu becomes tired of Śṛṅgāra and desires to experience pathos. He becomes the king of Magadha and then under the curse of Agastya sojourns at Malayagiri. He is now separated from his wife and in a state of utter helplessness entreats a *kokila* to convey his message to his wife.

The route which the *kokila* is asked to follow runs from Malayagiri to Kusumapura. The messenger, as usual, is at the very

outset eulogised and subsequently entreated to carry his message to his sweetheart. To reach Kusumapura the *kokila* is to follow a northward course and is to commence its journey after paying homage to Mahendra mountain where the Malaya breezes are blowing. The messenger must have his wife to accompany him lest he (the messenger) should feel the pangs of separation like the hero. After crossing the hermitage of Agastya at Malayakūṭa the messenger is to go to Śatamakhapurī and Tāmraparṇī where the Brāhmaṇas are highly learned. Other intermediate stages are Madhurā and the Sahya mountain where the messenger will be delighted to pay homage to Raṅganātha, Śeṣanāga and Padmanābha. The *kokila*, will then visit Tanjā Nagara, the Kāverī, the sacred river Tuṅgabhadrā, and the Kṛṣṇā and then would reach Kusumapura.

The actual message is described in the second part of the work.

The poem draws inspiration from the *Meghadūta* only in form and metre but not in spirit, although the predominant sentiment is pathos here too.

Kokilasandeśa of Uddaṇḍa

This poem by the famous author of the *Mallikāmāruta* containing 92 verses in the first and 69 verses in the second part is an imitation of *Śukasandeśa*. The poet leaves no trace of his identity but the poet Udaya, the author of the *Mayūrasandeśa*, has mentioned Uddaṇḍa as a great favourite in the Bālya country. Uddaṇḍa has mentioned Chennamangalam as the destination of his messenger in *Kokilasandeśa*. This city is identified with Villarvattam. According to Malabar tradition Uddaṇḍa was a great scholar, poet and debator who kept up his rank in the Zamorin's *Vidvatsadas* (Learned Assembly). After twelve years, the local Brahmin scholars became jealous and propitiated Durgā. With the grace of Durgā, a baby was born in the Brahmin family of Kakkasson. He grew up to be a great scholar, poet and debator. In his twelfth year he defeated Uddaṇḍa in Zamorin's *sadas*. The story of this poem runs thus:

A hero living with his beloved is taken away at night by a celestial being and is brought near the Conjeevaram temple. After two months, the month of Caitra approaches and he sees a *kokila*, through whom he sends the message to his beloved.

The route is described from Conjeevaram in the Chingleput District of the Madras State to a place called Chennamangalam (now a part of Kerala) between the two arms of the Alwaye river. The messenger is entreated to enter Malabar through Mysore (Hoysala kingdom) in the north-eastern corner. The poem closely follows Kālidāsa's *Meghadūta* in technique, and is supposed to be a complement to *Śukasandēśa* of Lakṣmīdāsa in so far as it describes such portions of Malabar as are not included in that poem.

The poem is written in the usual Mandākrāntā metre.

Bhṛṅgasandēśa of Vāsudeva⁶

Malayali poets have written *dūtakāvya*s both in Sanskrit⁷ as well as in Malayalam⁸ on the model of Kālidāsa's *Meghadūta*. In this *dūtakāvya*, Vāsudeva has marvellously interwoven the external nature depicted in the *Pūrvabhāga* with human feelings charmingly delineated in the *Uttarabhāga*. The number of verses is 95 and 80 in the first and second parts respectively. The poem is published in the Trivandrum Sanskrit Series, Trivandrum.

The theme and substance of the poem is that being charmed by the enticing handsomeness of a lover, enjoying sound sleep in his palace, a Yakṣī had snatched him away from the bedside of his beautiful consort Balanili.⁹ But she was forced to drop him down in a flower-garden in the vicinity of Padmanābhasvāmi temple at Trivandrum, due to the chance appearance of a Yakṣa. The lover finds himself in seclusion and is perplexed at this strange turn of events. In utter dismay he begins to contemplate over his fate but the sweet hummings of a *bhṛṅga* catch his fancy. The overwhelmed lover decides to send his message to his beloved through this *bhṛṅga*.

The poet here follows the conventional method of the *dūtakāvya*s. In the *Pūrvabhāga* the route is described. The *bhṛṅga*

is expected to travel from Trivandrum to Śvetadurga on the bank of Bharatapura, the abode of the beloved. The Uttara-bhāga contains the message which is expressed in a very simple style.

The poem is also known as *Bhramarasandeśa*, but the name intended by the poet was *Bhr̥ngasandeśa*.¹⁰

From Trivandrum to Śvetadurga is one month's¹¹ journey but it is completed in two days only. The beetle is endowed with some super-natural power.¹² In keeping with the dūtakāvya-tradition the poet describes some important places he has visited. According to Sāmbaśiva Śāstrī, the editor of the work, "he (the poet) has, in fact, surpassed all others by consigning all his personal experiences to the swing of poesy".

In this work the poet has mentioned the names of Śrī Nārāyaṇa Bhaṭṭapāda, Māṛḍallapaṇḍita¹³ and the famous astrologer Acyuta Piśāroṭa.¹⁴ All these men were probably his contemporaries. The poet has also praised the ruler of Trivandrum¹⁵ who ruled between 1563-1602 A.D. This Sandeśakāvya seems to have been written during that period. It sheds a welcome light on the historical and also the geographical data of that period.

Bhramarasandeśa of Mahāliṅga Śāstrī

This is a recent work written in the year 1923 A.D. by Mahāliṅga Śāstrī in *Śikhariṇī* metre and has one hundred and ten verses. The poet has written this poem on the model of Kālidāsa's *Meghadūta*. A resume of the subject-matter is:

Indra has killed Vṛtrāsura. The sin of murdering a Brāhmaṇa begins to haunt him in the shape of a dreadful ghost and Indra has no other alternative but to conceal himself in the lotus-tank of the Ganges. He thus gets separated from his beloved consort Śacī and in this sad separation sends a messenger to her. A bee is entreated to carry the message to her abode, the Indrapurī.

The route runs from Jahnuṣetra to heaven. Himālaya, Badarikāśrama, Sthāṇvāśrama, Oṣadhiprastha, Kailāsa, Mānasa lake and Svargaloka are the important places which the bee would like to see and enjoy during his journey.

The poem ends with the statement that by virtue of accidental pious recollections, Indra becomes purified of his sins and is released from the sin of *Brahmahatyā*. Bṛhaspati assists Indra in regaining his lost grandeur and his beloved Śacī.

The poet aims at conveying to the readers the philosophy of the Purāṇas, viz. *kṣīṇe punye martyalokaṃ viśanti*, that men come back to the earth from the heaven when their accumulated *punyas* (religious merits) are exhausted and when they do some good in this world they can again be eligible for admission to the heavenly abode.

Bhramaradūta of Rudra Nyāyavācaspati

This poem is attributed to Rudra Nyāyavācaspati. The complete poem contains 125 verses. The subject matter of this work has been taken from Vālmīki's *Rāmāyaṇa* with some innovations and alterations in the route. The theme of the poem is:

Hanumat has come back to Rāma who is staying at Citrakūṭa. Rāma hears from this messenger of the pitiable plight of his wife and becomes very sad. He recollects the days which he spent in the sweet company of his wife Sītā. He can no more bear separation and this creates a grave situation. Rāma becomes the Yakṣa of the *Meghadūta*. He is very sad. As the rainy season has arrived, he thinks that all men must be with their consorts. It is just then that a *bhramara*, a bee, appears there. Rāma entreats it to convey his message to Sītā who is under confinement in Laṅkā.

The poet then explains the route. He describes once again the sad condition of Sītā. Thereafter, the message is related to the bee. The last two verses are concerned with the poet's own identity, etc.

Bhṛṅgadūta of Śrīkṛṣṇa

The credit of bringing this work to light goes to S.P. Chaturvedi of Allahabad, (formerly of Nagpur). It was published in the Nagpur University Journal No. 3, December 1937. A critique on it was published by Chaturvedi in the *Proceedings and*

Transactions of the All India Oriental Conference, 6th Session, 1930, pages 623-632. We quote relevant extract from it which gives quite a nice description of this hitherto unknown work.

The work contains 126 verses in Mandākrāntā metre. Unlike the *Meghadūta* there are no Pūrvabhāga and Uttarabhāga divisions in it. All the verses form one unit, the work itself. The last stanza is in Upajāti metre and states the names of the author and the work. The theme of the work is:

A Gopī in feigned anger (*prāptamānāntarāyā*) quarrels with Kṛṣṇa and spends a restless night. The following morning, she sees nearby a bee humming merrily on the bloomed lotus flowers. With big tears in her sleep-idle eyes, she breathes a heavy sigh and asks the bee to take her message to her lover Śrī Kṛṣṇa. The way shown to the messenger is not exactly the one which the messenger must follow to reach its destination. What our author aims at, is to mention and describe the various scenes of *Vrajabhūmi* which are of great interest to the Gopīs and other devotees of Śrī Kṛṣṇa. The bee is asked to go first to the house of Nanda (*yāhi nandasya geham*). The garden, the Mālātī-bower, scenes of amorous sports (*kāmakrīḍāparimala*), the arch—all these are admirably described. Then comes the royal avenue (*rājavīthī*), where beautiful damsels are seen hurrying to their lovers' places and heart-attracting ball-games (*kandukakrīḍāḥ*) are being played. Reaching Gokula through a spacious gate, the messenger is to see the image of Gaṇeśa in the court-yard, and the worship of Rohiṇī. He is advised to enjoy the playing on musical instruments and the amorous dance in honour of the deity. Thence he is to go to the way leading to the (river) Yamunā and listen to the witty and confidential talks of the ladies who have gone there to fetch water. He is to keep himself aloof from these temptations and proceed on his undertaken errand. Now, comes the temple of *Vāgdevatā* (the goddess of speech) by whose grace even the animals can compose excellent poetic lines. This is followed by a very beautiful description of Lord Śiva's temple (*Kailāsadhāma*).

Patradūta of Rudradeva Tripāṭhī

This is a recent dūtakāvya¹⁶ written by Rudradeva Tripāṭhī, son of Ramākānta Śarmā who is described by the author as an astrologer. The work is published by Pandit Bhimadeva Tripāṭhī of Śhri Maheshwar Printing Press, Mandsores (M.P.). It contains 163 verses written in the Mandākrāntā metre. At the end of the work there are five photographic reproductions of the things and places described in the work, which has elicited praise from such critics as the editor of the *Madhuravāṇī*. The theme of the work is:

The author Rudradeva Tripāṭhī who is living in Bombay with one of his maternal uncles, Govinda Rāma Śarmā, sends a letter to his preceptor who is also one of the maternal uncles of the author living in Daśapura in the Mālava country. The letter is sent as a messenger to convey the best regards of the pupil, the author, to the preceptor, Rāma Candra on the Guru Pūrṇimā day. Just as the cloud in the *Meghadūta* is treated as a living being and human actions are ascribed to it, similarly, our author Rudradeva Tripāṭhī attributes all human actions to the letter. He also describes the route to be followed by the letter which lies between Bombay and Daśapura and passes through Dadar, Balsar, Bullimore, Navasari, Bhṛgupura, Revatī and Ratnapurī, etc. In between the poet takes a few moments off and describes in vivid detail the various places and scenes of Bombay with all its beauty-spots like Chowpatti, the Juhu Beach thronged with the merry-making people helping themselves with *Bhelpūri*, etc. and the buses and the trams plying. The journey of the letter commences from the Bombay Central Post Office from where it is put in a Dakvan, carried to the Railway Station and put in a train-compartment. It is described to be a witness to all, that takes place in the compartment; the breakfast by the people, the boisterous laughter of the people and the like. When the letter reaches Daśapura, it is asked to go to a Vidyālaya or a College-building where the author had pursued his studies sometime back. The letter is to deliver the message of best compliments of the pupil, the author, to the preceptor, the maternal uncle of the author.

Hamsadūta of Vāmanabhaṭṭa Bāṇa

Vāmanabhaṭṭa, a Brāhmaṇa of Vatsagotra, was the court-poet of Vemabhūpāla, the famous author of the *Śṛṅgārādīpikā* in the 15th century. The famous poet Bāṇa Bhaṭṭa, the court-poet of Śrī Harṣa who composed the *Kādambarī* and the *Harṣacarita* was also a Vatsagotra Brāhmaṇa. Bāṇa Bhaṭṭa is said to be a unique prose writer. In order to equal the fame won by him, Vāmanabhaṭṭa wrote a large number of books including this *Hamsadūta*. The subject-matter is the same as that of the *Meghadūta*.

A Yakṣa separated from his beloved, sends a message to his beloved consort Kandarpalekhā through a swan, who is expected to travel from Mount Malaya (the extreme south of India) to Alakā. The swan is to travel through Tāmrapaṇī and reach Madurā, the land of the Pāṇḍya kings. Thereafter, he is to go to Cauvery, the lands of the Rāṅgas and Colas, the Śiva temple of Puṇḍarikapura, Conjeevaram, the Pārvatī shrine at the bank of the river Kampā, and then is to cross the river Kanakamukharī. Thereafter, he is to pass through the Āndhras, the Kṛṣṇavātī, the Tuṅgabhadra, the Godāvarī and then traverse the Vindhya mountains, and cross the rivers Yamunā and Gaṅgā and travel through Vārāṇasī, Ayodhyā, Kurukṣetra, the Himālayas, the Krauñca mountain, the mount Kailāsa and reach Alakā.

The second part of the work contains a fine description of Alakā, the abode of the Yakṣa, and his message to his beloved consort.

The work as a whole is very interesting and is closely similar to the *Meghadūta*. The poet has a thorough mastery over language and rhetoric.

Hamsadūta of Rūpagosvāmin

Rūpagosvāmī, a disciple of Śrīcaitanya, was a great Vaiṣṇava of Bengal. Besides the *Hamsadūta*, a work of 142 verses in Śikhariṇī,¹⁷ he has a large number of other works to his credit.

The theme of this poem is:

Lalitā, on behalf of Rādhā and other cowherdesses sends a swan from Vṛndāvana to Mathurā where Lord Kṛṣṇa resides. The

swan is requested to follow the track of Kṛṣṇa's chariot driven by Akṛūra. He is further requested to have rest under the Kadamba tree behind which Kṛṣṇa used to hide himself while stealing the clothes of the Gopīs. He is also expected to visit the Govardhana mountain, a favourite resort of Kṛṣṇa, the Tamāla tree; the Kāliya lake where the Vṛndādevī had transformed herself into a Tulasī leaf, and from there to the famous town of Mathurā. The swan is to go there and see Kṛṣṇa busy in merry-making with the maidens singing songs of Vikadrū and the legendary tales narrated by Akṛūra. Kṛtavarman, Sātyaki, Garuḍa and others must be busy in Kṛṣṇa's service. The swan must look for an opportunity to see Kṛṣṇa when he is alone, otherwise, he would not like to hear the message sent by the village-maidens. He must request Kṛṣṇa not to forget them, who were earlier very near and dear ones to him, particularly Rādhā who cannot resist the pangs of separation any more.

The poem is rich in similes and the flight of imagination is spontaneous, although the theme is borrowed from the *Śrīmad-bhāgavata*.¹⁸

Hamsadūta of Veṅkaṭanātha Vedāntācārya

Veṅkaṭanātha and his son Varadanātha are famous poets of the 14th century. They are the followers of Rāmānuja. A large number of Sanskrit and Tamil works have been written by Vedāntācārya.

The theme of this poem is based on the *Rāmāyaṇa*. The messenger is a swan instead of Hanumat. The route which the swan is directed to follow is described. It runs from Mount Malayavat to Ceylon. The route described here is a repetition of the one described by Vāmana Bhaṭṭa Bāṇa and the poet has sufficient explanation ready for it. This path is safe and the heavy rains would not obstruct the movement of the passengers there. Hence the messenger is requested to travel through the Eastern Coast of the Madras Presidency. It is a bit longer route no doubt, but it will be free from any difficulty. The swan is expected to go to Karnāṭaka, Āndhra, Veṅkaṭācala, the river Kanakamukhari

flowing near Añjanādri, Satyavatīkṣetra, Hastiśaila at Conjeevaram situated on the northern bank of the river Vegavati, the Cola country, the Śvetaśaila, the Candrapuṣkariṇī on the bank of which the Vṛkṣācala and the Pāṇḍyadeśa are situated. Thereafter, comes the Tāmraparṇī, then the Subala mountain on the sea and finally the messenger reaches Ceylon. Sītā is found sitting under the cluster of green trees, where he conveys the message of Rāma.

The message is nothing new to us. But the poet aims at relating it through an outburst of pathos, the Vedānta doctrines and philosophy only in a new garb. However, the poet has tried to make this poem attractive by the beauty of his composition. He saves it from becoming a dull and monotonous song.

Haṁsasandeśa of Raghunāthadāsa

The theme of the work is exactly the same as that of the *Haṁsasandeśa* of Rūpagosvāmin. Generally the dūtakāvyas show the route first and then the message is conveyed but here the case is reverse. The poet relates the message in the first half of the poem and the second half contains the route. The theme is as follows:

Rādhā, the chief cowherdess cannot stand the pangs of separation from Kṛṣṇa. She deposes Lalitā, her trusted friend, to convey her message to Kṛṣṇa, who is living in Mathurā. The messenger is requested to describe the day-by-day worsening plight of the Gopīs. Kṛṣṇa has deserted them and this has made them miserable. Every month that passes brings fresh pain and agony. Their condition thus is getting from bad to worse.

They want nothing from Kṛṣṇa except a sweet and kind glance towards them failing which, they may not be able to keep their body and soul together.

Haṁsasandeśa of Pūrṇasarasvatī

The poem is written on the model of the *Meghadūta* with this difference that herein the message is being sent by the beloved to the lover. The story goes that once a maiden of Kāñcīpura saw

Lord Kṛṣṇa going out for a festival. She was charmed by his beauty but since he was residing at Vṛndāvana the poor beloved could not tolerate his separation. In utter confusion and dismay she sent a message to him. A swan was the messenger. The route from Kañcī to Vṛndāvana is described in a very nice way.

The poet seems to have lived sometime between the 12th and the 16th centuries.

Haṁsasandeśa (anonymous)

The poem is in line with the other dūtakāvyas, so far as the Mandākrāntā metre is concerned but in the subject matter it differs. The work is mainly concerned with Yoga and Vedānta. The complete poem consists of 101 verses and is divided into two parts having 50 and 51 verses respectively in the Pūrvasandeśa and the Uttarasandeśa. The theme is:

A devotee transforms his soul into a swan and sends it to *Rudrabhakti*, i.e. 'Devotion to Śiva'. Due to wordly engagements he remains away from his beloved, the *Bhakti* (Devotion). He, therefore, sets aside the wordly attachments and through his *Karman* regains his consciousness along with his beloved *Bhakti* (Devotion).

Śukasandeśa of Lakṣmīdāsa

This small poem is attributed to one Nambudiri Brāhmaṇa Lakṣmīdāsa of Karinnampilly, a small village situated on the bank of the Alwaye river (in modern Travancore). He seems to have flourished in the 13th century. The poem is composed on the model of the *Meghadūta*. The message is sent through a parrot from Rāmeśvaram to Trikkanamatilakam near Cranganur. It is one of the most important cities of the ancient Malabar kings. On his way, the messenger is to pass through Comorin and Trivandrum.

It is a nice lyric piece of one hundred and sixty two stanzas (having 73 and 89 verses in the first and second parts respectively). The hero is living in happiness in the sweet

company of his beloved. In a dream he finds himself suddenly transported to Rāmeśvaram or Rāmaśetu, the famous pilgrim-centre in South India. He then sees a parrot to whom he ascribes human organs, feelings and supernatural intelligence and through it sends his message to his wife at Guṇapuram.

It is a very interesting work but the message and the feeling of separation both take place in a dream.

Kīradūta of Rāmagopāla

This poem of 104 verses has been written by Rāmagopāla who is one of the scholars who composed *Vivādārṇavasetu* under the patronage of Rājā Kṛṣṇacandra of Navadvīpa.

The theme of this poem is the same as that of the other poems dealing with Kṛṣṇa and the Gopīs' love-affair. The messenger is a parrot who surely is the proper agency to convey the feelings and emotions of the Gopīs to Kṛṣṇa.

Kokasandēśa of Viṣṇutrāta

Viṣṇutrāta was a Malabar poet who flourished in the 16th century. He lived in the village named Vazappilli. The poem contains 120 and 196 verses in the first and the second parts respectively in Mandākrāntā metre. The poet has followed the traditional method of the dūtakāvyaś. The first part contains the description of the route to be followed in its travels by the messenger and the second part gives the message which is to be conveyed to the beloved.

A prince of Śrīvīhārapura is abducted by some unknown powerful magicians and taken away to a far off place. The prince does not know as to where he is and what has happened to him. He is much confused in a lonely place, and is not able to discover the identity of that place. He recollects the days spent in merry-making and then he thinks of the condition of his beloved wife. The bewilderment at that is acute. In this sad plight the lover sees a *koka* flying there whom he requests to take his message to Kāmārāmā, where his beloved lives. The *koka* goes to the beloved and tells her of the pangs of separation felt by the hero.

The poem is the longest one in the whole of the *dūtakāvya* literature in Sanskrit.

Cakorasandeśa of Perusūri

It is a fine love-lyric which in essence follows the *Megha-dūta*. The poet seems to have adorned the court of a king in Southern India, who had perhaps conferred upon him the title of *Navīna Patañjali* since the poet in the colophon calls himself so. The work is preserved as a fragment. The first part of it having 69 verses is complete in itself except for a few omissions, but the second part having 40 verses is incomplete. Verses 9 to 20 are found intact while all the remaining verses have a lacuna.

The theme of the work is that a certain lover did not pay due respect to Vyāghrapāda while he went to bow before Sundarēśa. The former cursed him and the poor lover had to sojourn at Kailāsa mountain. Only a month before the expiry of his term of curse, he saw a *cakora* through whom he sent his message to his beloved. The message, unlike in other *Kāvya*s, is not verbal, but written on a tree bark with mineral dyes. The first part describes the journey from Kailāsa to Hāla (the present Madhurā), the capital town of the Pāṇḍya country in the extreme south of India. The second part contains the message which is, however, incomplete.

The historical value of the first part is considerable, as there are descriptions of every important town, river and temple on the way. The second part (incomplete) describes the place where the beloved lives.

In the available part the author shows great qualities of literary craftsmanship and striking originality. His conceits are not usually laboured, and the chiselled and bejewelled phraseology gives an impression of rare beauty. The work can be ranked as an excellent production in the entire later *dūtakāvya* literature.

Mayūrasandeśa by Udaya

Prince Udaya was the famous author of *Kaumudī*, a commentary on the *Locana* on the *Dhvanyāloka* of

Ānandavardhana. The work under reference is written on the model of Kālidāśa's *Meghadūta*. It contains 107 and 92 verses in the Pūrva and the Uttarabhāgas respectively.

The message is sent by a person named Śrīkaṇṭha of Syānandūra (modern Trivandrum) to his consort residing at Annakara, a small village in Cochin State.

The distance to be travelled is eight miles only. A peacock is the messenger for this job. The route is described in a very simple style. There is a lot on the way to attract the attention of the messenger. The Uttarabhāga contains the message. The lover explains his sad condition due to his separation from his beloved wife.

The work is a nice imitation of two or three works of the South Indian poets namely, the *Śukasandēśa*, the *Kokilasandēśa* and the *Unnihilisandēśa* (Malayalam Kāvya). All of the three works are drawn upon but the presentation is the author's own. He has woven the material drawn from the three dūtakāvyaś into an artistic whole. In that lies his novelty. The poem is rich in nice descriptions of some of the most important towns of South India. The style is very simple but the method of narration is not very appealing.

Kākadūta of Gauragopāla Śiromaṇi

This was composed by Gauragopāla in 1811 Śaka year. Its theme is the same as that of the *Aniladūta*. Herein the message is sent by the cowherdresses to Kṛṣṇa.

The poet does not like to rely upon the messengers engaged by other poets. They have used Cloud, Swan, Wind and so on to deliver their messages but he criticizes such *dūtas* and in a large number of verses argues the superiority of *Kāka* to other *dūtas*. In his opinion only the *Kāka* is the fittest agency of *daūtya-karma* (conveyance of messages).

Unlike the other writers in the field, this poet does not worry much about the message or the messenger. He even does not care for the Gopīs. That is why he has failed to convey their message to Kṛṣṇa.

The poet seems to have composed this work to show off his skill in grammar and command over vocabulary.

Bakadūta of MM. Ajitanātha Nyāyaratna

Unfortunately only a fragmentary copy of this work is available. The poem is written in different metres. The route to be covered by the messenger runs from Kṛṣṇanagara to Navadvīpa.

Due to the absence of the initial part, the theme of this work cannot be made out with certainty but from the available stanzas one can gather that some Bhramarī whose husband is away, sends her message through a *Baka*.

Bhramarī is perhaps some heroine deserted by her lover who in utter sorrow seeks to convey her feelings to the lover. She asks him to think of her pitiable condition and come back to her.

It is a good love-lyric and the poet seems to be at his best here.

Śunakadūta of K.M. Kṛṣṇamūrti Śarmā

This small Sandeśakāvya of 30 verses in Mandākrāntā metre was published in 1954 A.D. in the quarterly Sanskrit magazine *Sārasvatī Suśamā* in the year 2011 of the Vikrama era. The theme of the poem is:

Intending to present an ornament to his beloved who is the daughter of his maternal uncle, a lover breaks into the house of a rich man and steals some gold but is caught red-handed and is awarded one year's imprisonment. He is feeling sad but he cannot escape from that stone-built jail. He, in utter helplessness, calls upon a dog whom he pleases with a sweet cake and entreats it to convey his feeling to his beloved consort who is residing at Mahiṣanagara¹⁹, at a distance of six miles to the west of that jail. The lover further instructs the dog to go through a village having the Viṭṭhala temple. The message is intended to console the beloved for some time till the lover reaches there.

The jail term expires. The lover earns some money by business, purchases gold bangles and offers these to his beloved.

The poem ends with a happy reunion of the two lovers.

It is written in a very nice style on the model of Kālidāśa's *Meghadūta*. The poet mentions this fact in his last verse.

Uddhavadūta of Mādhavakavīndra

A nice poem of 141 verses, it is written in the Mandākrāntā metre.

The theme of this work is only an elaboration of the idea found in a verse of the *Bhāgavatapurāṇa* wherein Kṛṣṇa sends Uddhava as a messenger to his parents and Gopīs residing at Vṛndāvana.

The poem begins with an enquiry about a stranger who visits the Gopīs. The Gopīs soon come to know that Uddhava is a messenger sent by Śrī Kṛṣṇa. He brings a message for Gopīs who without hearing him abruptly begin to describe their own miserable condition due to their separation from their friend. Under an emotional stress one of the cowherdesses becomes senseless. Uddhava tries to bring her to senses. He is perplexed to note that he cannot deliver the message to the Gopīs who instead start cutting jokes with him and ask him to convey their message to Kṛṣṇa. Finally, Uddhava tells Rādhā (the Gopī who fainted) he has come with a message from Kṛṣṇa.

The messenger appreciates Rādhā's devotion to Kṛṣṇa.

Uddhavasandeśa of Rūpagosvāmin

This poem composed by Rūpagosvāmin in the 16th century in Mandākrāntā metre consists of one hundred and thirty eight verses.

The subject-matter of this work is the same as that of the *Uddhavadūta* with slight variations. Kṛṣṇa persuades his friend Uddhava to convey his message to Gopīs residing at Vṛndāvana. The route from Mathurā to Vraja is related with a vivid description of some important things worth-seeing on the way. Kṛṣṇa sends his best wishes for his friends and pays homage to his parents.

The poem gives an account of some sacred places, rivers, centres of pilgrimage and thus is very useful to trace the geographical conditions in the contemporary period. The poet also gives a true history of the important towns flourishing in his time.

Uddhavadūta of Rājavallabha Miśra

The credit for bringing to light this hitherto unknown dūtakāvya belongs to late Pandit Baladeva Upādhyāya. He has published a beautiful critique on this which was published in the *Indian Historical Quarterly*, Vol. XII, 1936. We quote below some excerpts from it pertaining to the author of the work, its theme and literary excellence.

The author of this dūtakāvya is Rājavallabha Miśra who has also written upon it a useful commentary.... The kāvya was finished on the fifth day of the bright fortnight in the month of Āśvina (Sept.-Oct.) in the Vikrama year 1889, i.e., 1832 A.D..

It consists of 115 verses. The last two verses written in Anuṣṭubh metre give the date of the composition and describe the object of the work. The remaining 83 verses are chiefly concerned with the theme which is taken from the life of Kṛṣṇa, a constant source of inspiration to poets. The poem opens with Uddhava seated under the *Kadamba* tree and surrounded by the young Gopīs of Vṛndāvana. The ladies naturally become exceedingly pleased to find the friend of their dear Kṛṣṇa and take the opportunity to give vent to their pent-up feelings of deep anguish at the indifference of their once most beloved companion and begin to shower bitter reproaches on the familiar scenes and objects of the Vṛndā groves. The Gopī's lament begins in verse 3 and extends upto the 16th verse. The reproaches are directed at first to the mount Govardhana (3), to the cuckoo (4- 5), to the cloud (6-8), to the river Yamunā (9), to the black bee (10), to the animals of the forest like the deer and peacock (11), to the mango tree (12) and lastly to the Vṛndāvana itself which was once the scene of their confidential talks and meandering walks. This will of the ladies moves Uddhava who is deeply pained at finding the love of the Gopīs disregarded by his own companion. He gives

them the message of true and novel love which inspite of physical separation, always gets fixed and greatly developed under such trying circumstances (19).

After this Uddhava returns to Mathurā where he gives a full and glowing description of the noble sentiments of the Vraja Gopīs and the deep agony of their heart due to cold indifference shown to them by Kṛṣṇa. This speech of Uddhava forms the main body of this poem and extends from 21st to 82nd verse. The description of Gopīs' condition has its desired effect on Kṛṣṇa's mind, who is deeply touched (83). With this the poem comes to an end.

The author has achieved notable success in placing before his readers his own conception of true love and in describing the noble emotions of the human heart when separated from a person who is truly lovable.

Pānthadūta of Bholānātha

This small work has been composed by a modern poet of Tikuri. It has 105 verses in Śārdūlavikrīḍita metre with the exception of the two²⁰ which are in Vasantatilakā. Two verses, i.e. 63 and 64 are incomplete and verse 104 is missing. The work is published in the *Prācyavāṇī Sanskrit Series*, Calcutta.

The poet commences the work with a *maṅgalaśloka*²¹, enunciating the philosophy of the *Gītā*.²² It would thus appear that he is an adherent of Vaiṣṇavism. Generally the dūtakāvyas are written in two parts, the first part giving the route, and the second, the message but this poem is an exception, as the poet starts with the message abruptly after the benedictory verse. The theme of the work is as follows:

Śrīkṛṣṇa leaves Vṛndāvana and sojourns at Mathurā. He does not send news of his whereabouts. Nor does he send a message to the cowherdesses of Vraja with whom he has been playing throughout his childhood and whose sweet company he has been enjoying. Once Rādhā goes to the river Yamunā,²³ and sees its blue waters. She loses her senses when she remembers Kṛṣṇa's absence, but comes to herself when her friends sprinkle fresh

water of the holy river on her face. At the same time the Gopīs catch sight of a traveller bound for Mathurā through whom they like to send their message. They entreat him to tell Kṛṣṇa that it does not behove him to forget them altogether. They are in a very miserable plight and Durgā stands witness to this fact. The Gopīs remark that Kṛṣṇa has perchance lost his sense and sensibility since he has sucked Pūtanā's²⁴ milk. He should follow the example of Śiva who is of the form of Ardhanārīśvara. Kṛṣṇa is definitely a cunning²⁵ lover, a hypocrite²⁶, and really the son of rustic parents.²⁷ One of the Gopīs continues to censure him²⁸ till at last she falls on the ground²⁹ senseless. Another Gopī then continues the thread saying that Kubjā and Kṛṣṇa are both crooked and Fate has skilfully made him a fit match although Kubjā cannot compare with Rādhā's feet.³⁰ Kṛṣṇa is a murderer³¹ of womenfolk³² and a cowherd.³³ He has attained a high rank only with the divine power so kindly bestowed upon him by Yaśodā, but he must not boast of his valour since the same mother who fed him on her milk has withdrawn her affection from him. After killing Kaṁsa he has enthroned Ugrasena clearly with a motive to carouse with his handsome maidens; and he is liable to be punished for this act.

Finally, Rādhā declares that he is her only resort and that she is entirely devoted to him. Her only prayer is that she should remain his lovable consort in all the future births that she may have.

The idea of the poet, as it would appear from the theme detailed above, is to propagate Viṣṇubhakti through this small love-lyric.

Gopīdūta by Lambodara Vaidya

The author appears to be a court-poet of the modern times. He enjoyed the patronage of a Rājā named Jagaddurlabha. The poem has not been published so far. In essentials it is similar to the other dūtakāvya with the Kṛṣṇa-Gopī theme.

The message is sent by the cowherdresses to Kṛṣṇa whom they see when he is going in his chariot. The dust raised by the high

speed of the chariot falls in their eyes. The cowherdesses feel hurt and all of them fall senseless. After a time they send a messenger to convey their feelings towards their Lord.

Nemidūta of Vikrama

The author was the son of Asaṅga. He lived at Khambhat (Gujarat). Ṛṣabhadāsa, a celebrated poet in Gujarat was his brother. The last line in each stanza in this work is taken from the *Meghadūta* of Kālidāsa. The poem begins with the message. No route is mentioned herein.

The first chapter contains a description of Neminātha's pleasures and activities in his boyhood. The second chapter describes the Vasanta or the spring season and the pleasures of the hero in that pleasant season. The third chapter gives a description of the marriage preparation of the hero. The last chapter contains a description of the grave and the sad state of Rājimatī, the beloved consort of the hero, who sends her message to him asking him to abandon the idea of becoming a recluse.

The poem aims at placing before the readers the virtues of the Jaina Dharma.

Manodūta of Indreśa Bhaṭṭa

This small poem of 45 verses in different metres is attributed to one Indreśa of Gokula who flourished towards the end of the 18th century. He belongs to the Vallabhācārya school.

Indreśa sends his mind from Mathurā to Dvārakā where Kṛṣṇa resides. The route is described in the same style as in the other dūtakāvyas. The messenger is to go to Jaipur, Kotah, Kartarpur, Udaipur and such other places and reach Dvārakā. On the way it is to have the much sought for *darśana* of Kṛṣṇa in various forms. The mind is entreated to go to Kṛṣṇa and request him to call the poet to stay with him. The poem is written in a beautiful style.

Hṛdayadūta of Harihara Bhaṭṭa

The author of the poem was a famous Vaiṣṇava of the Vallabhācārya school. He was born in a village named

Devarṣigrāma (modern Deoria) near about the year 1560 of the Vikrama era.

The poem is written in Vasantatilakā except the last verse which is in Sragdharā.

It is an excellent devotional poem. The subject-matter is the message sent by the poet to Śrīkṛṣṇa. The poet's own heart is the messenger. The route to be followed runs from Prayāga to Mathurā. The poet aims at giving expression to his own thoughts through the medium of a dūtakāvya. He criticises the Vāmamārga while he appreciates the Dakṣiṇamārga in the *Nirguṇa viśiṣṭamārga* of Śrī Vallabhācārya. There are some verses in which original ideas have been expressed in a beautiful language. The poet has made a successful attempt to fashion the dry bones of philosophy and religion into a throbbing body with a glorious kāvya-soul full of inspiration and sentiment. The message commences after verse 104. The messenger is asked to request Lord Kṛṣṇa to allow him a place in his lotus-like feet.

Manodūta of Trailaṅga Vajranātha

This poem of 102 verses in Śikhariṇī was composed in the year 1758 at Vṇdāvana. The poet adopts for his theme the famous episode of gambling in the court of the Kauravas at Hastināpura and the insult of Draupadī.

The poem begins with some benedictory verses. From the 11th verse onwards six verses are devoted to the visit of Duryodhana to Pāṇḍavas' *yajña*. The Kuru king is amazed at the strange palace of the Pāṇḍavas who laughed at him. He comes back deeply sad and tells Śakuni the cause of his sorrow, who after consulting him prepares a scheme of playing dice with Yudhiṣṭhira who is not so experienced in it. The trap is laid to deprive him of his richer empire and even Draupadī. The scheme is put into operation and it achieves the desired result. Draupadī is dragged into the court by Duṣṣāsana.

The real dūtakāvya commences from verse 133 where Draupadī in a state of utter helplessness asks her own mind to

go to Dvārakā and request Kṛṣṇa to come and help her. Kṛṣṇa hurries up and furnishes *sārīs* of multifarious designs and thus saves her from a grave situation. The poem ends in praise of Viṣṇu worship which is the only path to achieve eternal peace.

The poem is a labyrinth of a queer type where the poet, while describing the court of Yudhiṣṭhira, is busy with demonstrating his knowledge of and skill in astrology, medicine, military science, architecture, Mīmāṃsā, grammar, etc. But the work is not lacking in rhetorical excellence. Qualities of composition such as Anuprāsa, cohesion, lucidity and pregnancy of expression are found throughout the work. The figures of speech have enriched and embellished the composition. Few poets could be so talented as the author. Though modelled on the *Meghadūta*, this dūtakāvya, is, as a matter of fact, least indebted to it.

Manodūta of Viṣṇudāsa

One of the best known poets of Bengal, Viṣṇudāsa flourished in the 15th century. He was the saint-poet closely related to Caitanyadeva. He composed this poem of 101 stanzas in order to convey his feelings to the common people. The message and the messenger are both super-human. The theme of this work is as follows:

After having studied the sacred books like the Purāṇas the poet feels that one must fully devote oneself to penance and worship. In the beginning the poet thinks of his own deeds and then makes up his mind to seek refuge in Viṣṇu's worship. His own mind is the messenger whom he tells the route and the charm of the *Viṣṇubhakti*. He asks the messenger to go through Gokula, Yamunā, Vṛndāvana and reach Kṛṣṇa. In the end he explains his message of atonement and longing for *Bhakti* in order to attain emancipation.

Manodūta of Rāmaśarmā

Only a fragmentary copy of this work is available with the Vaṅgiya Sāhitya Pariṣat, Calcutta. From the colophon of this

poem we gather that the work is a messenger-poem written in a very simple style though not free from some minor lapses which confuse the sense and mar the beauty of some of the stanzas. The theme of the work is:

The poet is a great scholar having complete faith in and true devotion to Kṛṣṇa. He is absorbed in *Bhakti*. In his contemplative mood he experiences a catechism, a discussion in question and answer-form, between the mind and a Dvija. The mind and the Dvija discuss the *Viṣṇubhakti*. The Dvija requests the mind to convey his message to Kṛṣṇa to be kind to his devotees. The Dvija reveals some noble virtues of the mind while conveying its message to Kṛṣṇa.

Śīladūta of Cāritrasundaragaṇi

It is a fine poem composed by a learned Jaina poet with 131 verses in Śikhariṇī metre. The method adopted by the poet is very attractive and simple. He has interwoven the last line of each verse of the *Meghadūta* in all of his stanzas. The story runs as follows:

Prince Sthūlabhadra was enjoying his days in the sweet company of his beloved Kośā. Feeling very sad due to the sudden demise of his father, he abstains from the sensuous pleasures and abruptly brushes aside all the wordly attachments. He considers all the wealth, and the relations etc. to be debasing objects and observes celibacy. As a recluse he sojourns with a saint named Bhadrabāhu, his venerable Guru.

Kośā in utter despair requests him to remain with her. She tries to attract him by narrating the charms and the pleasures of life. She suggests that he stay in his own capital where he has a very nice pleasure hill and a temple built by his predecessors with great labour and carry on with his worship there. But by dint of his forceful arguments and his noble character the saint at last moulds his wife to accept the path of emancipation. In the end she also leaves her home and becomes a true votary of her husband and embraces Jainism.

The object of the poet is to propagate the canons and the virtues of the Jaina religion.

Vānmaṇḍanaguṇadūta of Vīreśvara

This poem is written in the Śārdūlavikrīḍita except the last verse which is in Mālinī. The total number of verses is 201.

Unlike other dūtakāvyas which are generally Virahakāvyas, this work is with a different motive. Its subject-matter is:

The poet longs to win the sympathy and patronage of a king named Bhīmasena, and sends him his own poetic quality as a messenger, though as an intermediary, a learned Brāhmaṇa is engaged for this work. The Guṇadūta is to go from Rāgapura to Kālībhatti (in Māyāpura) and complete the journey in five days. The Guṇadūta, *en route* to the place of destination, passes the first night at Maṇḍapa village, the second at Navīsarīha, and the third at Prātaśvenapura. The fourth night is to be spent under the magnanimous hospitality of Omkāra of Cāraṇa and his younger brother Rāmaji. On the last day before the messenger reaches Kālībhatti, he is to relate the message of the poor poet first to Daśaratha, the royal priest, and then under his advice and by his benign grace to King Bhīmasena.

The poet is a great grammarian and a perfect master of Sanskrit poetics. He has created his own independent theme and is under least obligation to his predecessors.

Bhaktidūta of Kālīprasāda

This small poem of 23 stanzas is composed by a modern Pandit named Kālīprasāda.

It deals with the way to emancipation. The message is sent through *Bhakti* (devotion).

Tulasīdūta of Trilocana

Tulasīdūta, a love-lyric of 55 verses was composed in 1933 Vikrama era, i.e. 1805 A.D.

Like some other dūtakāvyas the *Tulasīdūta* is also written on Kṛṣṇa and Gopī's love-affairs. Kṛṣṇa has gone to Madhopur and the cowherdresses sit together and discuss among themselves this desertion. They see a Tulasī plant in the garden through which

they choose to convey their feelings to Kṛṣṇa. The last twenty verses are concerned with the message which the Tulasī plant is requested to convey.

The poet has not described the route to be followed by the messenger but this is definitely said that it is not to go all by itself. The Gopīs send two guards to escort their messenger. One is the sandalwood fragrance and the second is their own *Bhakti*. The Gopīs request the messenger to relate their message to Kṛṣṇa when he is all alone and in seclusion and not when he is thirsty, hungry or going to bed.

Padmadūta of Siddhanātha Vidyāvāgīśa

It is a poem of 62 verses in Mandākrāntā metre. Its theme is:

Sītā is in confinement at Laṅkā. She is suffering from the pangs of separation. To her good luck she, through some reliable source, hears that Rāma is building a bridge over the sea and will reach Laṅkā as soon as it is completed.

The news blazes the dimly flickering love-candle and Sītā gets very sad. She cannot stay without her husband but she is helpless. Fortunately she sees a *padma* (lotus). She requests it to convey her feelings to Rāma.

The poet is a Naiyāyika. The philosophical and even the autobiographical portions of this work make a difficult reading. The work has not been commented upon so far.

The poem is also a strange riddle. The first 12 verses deal with objects which arouse the passion of the heroine. Then one verse describes the *dūta-darśana*. A number of verses are devoted merely to the praise of the lotus. Then follows a description of the virtues of the hero and his courageous deeds. It is only in the last verse that the reader comes to know of the message.

There is no mention of the route followed by the messenger.

Pādapadūta of Gopendranātha

The poet, a resident of Navadvīpa, reveals that Śrī Gaurāṅga has gone to Nīlaśaila. His dear wife is suffering from the pangs of separation. She wants to convey her feelings to Śrī Gaurāṅga

through a *nimba* tree growing in her courtyard. The messenger is to travel from Navadvīpa to Śrīkṣetra via Nadia state, Śāntipura, Trivenī, Sundaravana, Bay of Bengal, Vaitaraṇī river and such other places.

Mudgaradūta of Rāmāvatāra Śarmā

This is a modern work written by a learned scholar. It is a parody of 148 verses having dig at modern society. Mūrkhadeva (a stupid) does not believe in having a progeny since his father will serve the purpose of his son. Mūrkhadeva, therefore, observes celibacy and abstinence and lives in the Rāmagiri Āśramas. For him even the mortal frames of learned scholars are unchaste. He sends a messenger to his 'widow' wife to tell her of his own state. The route for the messenger is very long. The messenger, the Mudgara, the hammer, is to go to New York, Victoria Terminus, Persian Gulf, Red Sea, France, Switzerland, the Mediterranean Sea, Egypt, Italy, Gibraltar, Spain and so on.

The poem is very interesting and offers a well-considered criticism of all the evils prevailing in the modern Hindu society. The poet follows the traditional method of the dūtakāvyas and interweaves phrases and lines from the *Meghadūta* into different stanzas of his work.

Padāṅkadūta of Śrīkṛṣṇa Sārvabhauma

This small poem contains 46 verses in the Mandākrāntā metre. It was composed at the instance of King Raghurāma Rāya who ruled over Bengal in the beginning of the 17th century. The poet was a famous scholar of the time and wrote a large number of other works of vital importance. The theme of the work is:

Rādhā is feeling sad since Kṛṣṇa left for Mathurā. The pangs of separation are daily becoming acute, and the Gopīs consider his stay at Vṛndāvana to be a tragedy. Kṛṣṇa had promised to come back soon to the Gopīs but now it appears that it was only a hoax. Gopīs send their 'mind' as a messenger but it does not turn up. Desire, on account of its heavy weight cannot serve the purpose of Gopīs. The Gopīs, therefore, decide to send the foot-

print of Kṛṣṇa as a messenger and ask it to go to Mathurā or Gokula wherever Kṛṣṇa may be found.

The messenger is requested to go to their cunning lover and entreat him to come back failing which Rādhā would die.

The main interest of the work lies in the appropriate use of the Nyāyaparibhāṣās for conveying poetic concepts.

Ghaṭakarpara-Yamaka-Kāvya

Ghaṭakarpara holds a high position among the poets of Sanskrit. He is considered to be one of the nine gems of the court of Yaśodharmadeva Vikramāditya, and a contemporary of Kālidāsa.

Although this *Yamakakāvya* consists of 23 verses only, it is a fine specimen of Sandeśakāvya. The difference between the *Meghadūta* and this kāvya is that here the message is being sent by a lady to her lover. The messenger is the same in both the works. The time of sending the message is the rainy season but the duration of separation is different. The lady suffers a month's separation while Kālidāsa's Yakṣa full one year's.

The poem begins with the description of the rainy season (the first six verses). The following six verses are addressed to the cloud. Then the lady narrates the message in some verses followed by others which are her own soliloquy. The last two verses give the poet's own identity, etc.

The poem has won appreciation of a large number of learned scholars like Śaṅkara, Vidyānātha, Divākara and Abhinavagupta.

GEOGRAPHICAL IMPORTANCE OF THE DŪTAKĀVYAS

The dūtakāvyas, modelled on the *Meghadūta* of Kālidāsa which they faithfully follow by and large in structure do not usually omit its essential points. As Kālidāsa has shown the route which the cloud had to follow in its movement from Rāmagiri to Alakāpuri, the authors of the dūtakāvyas too, (some of them of course) were not found wanting in the mention of the routes to be followed by their respective dūtas. As these poets have gone

in for all kinds of *dūtas*, so they have described different routes too with the result that they throw a flood of light on the geography and the topography of the country in the different periods during which the *dūtakāvya*s continued to be produced in its various parts. We may mention below some of the *dūtakāvya*s and the routes shown in them.

Meghadūta of Kālidāsa

Journey : Rāmagiri—Alakā

Route : Rāmagiri—the plateau of Māla—Mount Āmrakūṭa—river Narmadā—Daśārṇa country—Vidiśā on the river Vetravati—rivers Sindhu and Nirvindhya—the country of Avanti—Ujjayinī—the stream Gambhīrā—Devagiri hill—the river Carmaṇvati—the region of Daśapura—the country of Brahmāvarta and Kurukṣetra—the river Sarasvatī—Kanakhala—the Mānasa Lake—the Mount Kailāsa—the city of Alakā.

Haṁsadūta of Vāmana Bhaṭṭabāṇa

Journey : Malaya range—Alakā

Route : Malaya range (Travancore range)—Tāmrapaṇī—Madurā—Kāverī—Śrīraṅgam—Cola country—Aruṇācala—Kāñcī—Kāla-hasti-mandira—Kanaka-mukharī (river)—Kṛṣṇaveṇī (river)—
 Tīṅgabhadra—Godāvari—Pañcavaṭī—
 Vindhyaṇā—Sarayū—Gaṇḍakī—Krauñcaparvata.

Pavanadūta of Dhoyi

Journey : Malaya range—Vijayapura.

Route : Malaya range—Pāṇḍya country—Tāmrapaṇī—Uragapura (Uraiyur)—Setubandha Rāmeśvara—Kāñcīpura—Kāverī—the mount Malayavat—Pañcāpsaras (lake)—Āndhra country—Godāvari—the city of Kalinga—Vindhya Pradeśa—

Narmadā—Yayātinagarī—Suhmadeśa—Trivenī—
Vijayanagara (Bengal), the capital of King
Lakṣmaṇasena.

Hamsasandeśa of Vedāntadeśika

Journey : Mount Malayavat—Laṅkā.

Route : The mount Malayavat—Añjanādri (Veṅkaṭādri)—
Kanakamukharī (river)—Tuṇḍirapradeśa—
Satyavratākṣetra—Kāñcī—Vegā (river)—
Hastīśaila—Cola country—the white mountain
(Śvetaśaila) Kāverī—Śrīraṅgam—Pāṇḍya
country—Vṛṣabhādri—Tāmrapaṇī—the mount
Malaya—the mount Suvela (on the shore or the
middle of the ocean)—Laṅkā.

Śukasandeśa of Lakṣmidāsa

Journey : R ā m e ś v a r a m — G u ṇ a k ā p u r a m
(Trikkāṇāmatilakam).

Route : Setubandha Rāmeśvaram—along the bank of the
ocean—Tāmrapaṇī (river)—Maṇanlūr, the capital
of the Pāṇḍya kings (Manalor)—Sahyaparvata—
Kerala country—Syānandūra—(Trivandrum)
Kulapurī—(capital of the Kūpaka kings)
Kolambadeśa (Quilon)—Vallabhagrāma
(Tiruvalla)—Bimbali—Sindhuvīpa (the
cantonment of Bimbali kings (Katalaturuttu) Phullā
(river)—Subrahmaṇya mandira—Paśupatikṣetra—
Cūrṇī (Alwaye or Periyar)—Mahodayapurī
(Tiruvancikkulam), the capital of Kerala kings—
Guṇakāpurī (Trikkāṇāmatilakam).

Kokilasandeśa of Uddaṇḍa

Journey : Kāñcī—Jayantamaṅgala.

Route : Kāñcī—Kampā river—Kṣīrasindhunadī (Palar)—
Cola country—Bilvakṣetra—Kāverī—
Hosaladeśa—Lakṣmīnārāyaṇapura—Sahya

mountain—Kerala region—Vāṇmayī (river)—
Purali (Kottayam) Śambaradeśa—Koladeśa—
Kukkuṭakroḍa (Calicut) Prakāśadeśa—
(Vekkattunar)—Śvetāranya (Triprangor)—Nilā
(river)—the region of Netranārāyaṇīya
Brāhmaṇas—the Raṇakhala region (Porkal)—
Vṛṣapurī—Khalapurī (Tiruvancikkul)
Saṅgamagrāma (Iringalakkut)—Kurumbavana—
Añjanakhalapurī (Tiruvancikkul)—Cūrṇī (river)—
Jāyantamaṅgala (Cannamangala).

Indudūta of Vinayavijayagaṇi

Journey : Yodhapura—Sūrat.

Route : Yodhapura (Jodhpur)—the mount Suvarṇagiri—the
temples of Mahāvīra and Pārśvanātha—Jālandhara
(Jalor)—(the city of) Rohiṇī—the mount Arbuda
(Mount Abu)—Acalaparvata—Jaina temple of king
Kumārapāla—Sindhupuram on the banks of the
river Sarasvatī—the river Sābhramatī (Sabarmatī)
Rājadrāṅga (Ahmedabad)—the city of Vāṭapadrī
(Baroda)—Narmadā—Bhṛgupura (Broach)—the
river Tāpī (Tāpti)—Sūryapura (Sūrat).

Meghadūtasamasyālekha of Meghavijaya

Journey : Aurangabad—Dvīpapurī (Dīv Bandor, Diu,
Gujarat).

Route : Navyaraṅgapurī (Aurangabad)—the mount
Devagiri—the city of Devagiri—the mount Solor—
the mount Tuṅgilā—the river Tāpī—Bhṛgupura
(Broach)—Narmadā—the river Mahī—Siddha-
śaila—Śatruñjaya (a Jaina pilgrim centre)—
Dvīpapurī (Diu).

Mayūrasandeśa of Udaya

Journey : Trivandrum—Kottayam.

Route : Trivandrum—along the ocean—Viṣṇu temple at

Varkala—Quilon—Iṅgudī country—the capital city of Kaṇṭhiyūr—a Kālī temple and the Vallabha temple—the Manikaṇṭha temple—Vaṅculā (river)—Kottayam.

Kokasandēśa of Viṣṇutrāta

Journey : Vihārapurī to Kāmārāmā.

Route : Vihārapurī—Varaṇā—the lake of Sundara—the capital city of Sacandrā—the city of Śāntākārā—Ramyā (the river)—the region of Lokabhadra Śiva—Ayodhyā—Kāmārāmā.

CLASSIFICATION OF DŪTAKĀVYAS ON THE BASIS OF RELIGIOUS SECTS

Jaina dūtakāvyaś

1. *Pārśvābhyaḍaya-Jinasena*
2. *Nemidūta-Vikramakavi*
3. *Meghadūta-Merutunga*
4. *Śīladūta-Cāritrasundaragaṇi*
5. *Pavanadūta-Vādicandra*
6. *Cetodūta-Anonymous*
7. *Indudūta-Vinayavijayagaṇi*
8. *Meghadūtasamasyālekha-Meghavijaya*

Vaiṣṇava dūtakāvyaś

(i) Kṛṣṇa

1. *Uddhavadūta-Rūpagosvāmin*
2. *Uddhavadūta-Mādhavakavindra*
3. *Haṁsadūta-Rūpagosvāmin*
4. *Padāṅkadūta-Śrīkṛṣṇa Sārvabhauma*
5. *Pikadūta-Rudra Nyāyapañcānana*
6. *Pāṇhadūta-Bholānātha*
7. *Bhṛṅgadūta-Śatāvadhānakavi*
8. *Manodūta-Viṣṇudāsa*
9. *Pādapadūta-Gopendranātha Gosvāmin*
10. *Haṁsa Sandeśa-Pūrṇasarasvatī*

(ii) Rāma

11. *Haṁsa Sandeśa-Vedāntadeśika*
12. *Bhramaradūta-Rudra Nyāyapañcānana*
13. *Vāladūta-Kṛṣṇanātha Nyāyapañcānana Bhaṭṭācārya*

Śaiva dūtakāvyaś

1. *Haṁsa Sandeśa*
(Anonymous)

CLASSIFICATION OF DŪTAKĀVYAS ON THE BASIS OF DŪTAS

Natural Phenomena		Natural Objects		Material Objects		Human Beings	
Megha (cloud)	Pavana (wind)	Candra (moon)	1. <i>Padmadūta</i> Siddhānta Vidyāvāgīśa	1. <i>Mudgaradūta</i> Rāmāvatāra Śarmā	1. <i>Uddhavadūta</i> Mahakavīndra	1. <i>Uddhava- Sandeśa</i> Rūpagosvāmin	1. <i>Gopīdūta</i> Lambodara Vaidya
	Dhoyi						
2. <i>Jaina Meghadūta</i> Merutunga	2. <i>Vāṭadūta</i> Kṛṣṇanātha	2. <i>Candradūta</i> Vinayaprabhu	2. <i>Pādapadūta</i> Gopendra- nātha	3. <i>Patradūta</i> Rudradeva Tripāṭhi	4. <i>Pānthadūta</i> Bholaṇātha	5. <i>Nemidūta</i> Vikrama	5. <i>Nemidūta</i> Vikrama
	3. <i>Aniladūta</i> Rāma- Dayālu Tarkālankāra	3. <i>Indudūta</i> Vinayavijja- yagaṇi	3. <i>Patradūta</i> Rudradeva Tripāṭhi				
4. <i>Meghābhya- daya</i> (Anonymous)	4. <i>Pavanadūta</i> Vādicandra	4. <i>Candradūta</i> Śrīkṛṣṇa Tarkālankāra	4. <i>Tulasīdūta</i> Trilocana	5. <i>Nemidūta</i> Vikrama	5. <i>Nemidūta</i> Vikrama	5. <i>Nemidūta</i> Vikrama	5. <i>Nemidūta</i> Vikrama
	5. <i>Meghadūta- samasyālekha</i> Meghavijaya	5. <i>Meghadūta- samasyālekha</i> Meghavijaya	5. <i>Meghadūta- samasyālekha</i> Meghavijaya				
6. <i>Megha-pratisandeśa</i> Mandikal Rāmasāstrī	6. <i>Megha-pratisandeśa</i> Mandikal Rāmasāstrī	6. <i>Megha-pratisandeśa</i> Mandikal Rāmasāstrī	6. <i>Megha-pratisandeśa</i> Mandikal Rāmasāstrī	5. <i>Nemidūta</i> Vikrama	5. <i>Nemidūta</i> Vikrama	5. <i>Nemidūta</i> Vikrama	5. <i>Nemidūta</i> Vikrama
7. <i>Yakṣa-milana</i> Paramēśvara Jha.	7. <i>Yakṣa-milana</i> Paramēśvara Jha.	7. <i>Yakṣa-milana</i> Paramēśvara Jha.	7. <i>Yakṣa-milana</i> Paramēśvara Jha.				

CLASSIFICATION OF DŪTAKĀVYAS ON THE BASIS OF DŪTAS

ABSTRACT CONCEPTIONS		BIRDS	
<i>Manas</i>	<i>Miscellaneous</i>	<i>Haniśa</i> (Swan)	<i>Kokila</i> (Cuckoo) (Anas Casarca)
1. <i>Manodūta</i> Viṣṇudāśa	1. <i>Śīladūta</i> Cāritra Sundaragaṇi	1. <i>Haniśadūta</i> Vāmana Bhaṭṭa Bāṇa	1. <i>Pikadūta</i> Rudra-Nyāya pañcānana
2. <i>Manodūta</i> Rāmaśarmā	2. <i>Vāiṃanāṇḍa-</i> <i>nagunādūta</i> Vireśvara	2. <i>Haniśadūta</i> Rūpagosvāmin	2. <i>Kokiladūta</i> Haridāśa
3. <i>Manodūta</i> Indreśa Bhaṭṭa	3. <i>Bhaktidūta</i> Kālīprasāda	3. <i>Haniśadūta</i> Venkateśanātha Vedāntācārya	3. <i>Pikadūta</i> Ambikācaraṇa Devaśaraṇa
4. <i>Hṛdayadūta</i> Harihara Bhaṭṭa		4. <i>Haniśa-Sandēśa</i> Raghunātha- dāśa	4. <i>Kokila</i> Sandēśa Uddanḍa
5. <i>Manodūta</i> Trailāṅga Vajranātha		5. <i>Haniśadūta</i> Kavīndrācārya Sarasvatī	5. <i>Kokila</i> Sandēśa Venkātācārya
6. <i>Cetodūta</i> (Anonymous)		6. <i>Haniśa-Sandēśa</i> Pūṛṇa / sarasvatī	6. <i>Bhṛiṅga-san-</i> <i>deśa-Vāsudeva</i> 2. <i>Bhramara-sandēśa</i> Mahāliṅga Sastrī 3. <i>Bhramaradūta</i> Rudra Nyāya- pañcānana
		7. <i>Haniśa-Sandēśa</i> (Anonymous)	1. <i>Mayūra-sandēśa</i> Udaya.
			1. <i>Kokasandēśa</i> Viṣṇutrāta
			2. <i>Cakora-</i> <i>Sandēśa</i> Perusūri
			2. <i>Ghaṭākarpara</i> <i>Yamaka Kāvya</i> , Ghaṭākarpara
			Miscellaneous

REFERENCES

1. Vallabhadeva (10th century) has 111 verses; Mallinātha (14th century) has 121 verses; Dakṣiṇāvartanātha (12th century) 110 verses; Pūrṇasarasvatī 110 verses; Tibetan version of *Meghadūta* 117 verses; Panabokke (Ceylonese version) 118 verses; India Office Manuscript of *Meghadūta* 110 verses; V.S. Agrawala edition, 115 verses; C.S.R. Sastri 115 verses. (He has also given a separate list of 5 *śloka*s which he considers to be interpolated.) Vidvan G. J. Somayāji, Madras 124 verses; K. B. Pathak 120 verses; Sthiradeva 112 verses; Vasanta Ramachandra Nerurkar, Bombay 118 verses (He has given 9 verses separately which he considers to be spurious.), J. B. Chaudhury, Calcutta, 114 verses.
2. MS. No. 5003, 11 pages, 26 verses, V. V. R. I., Hoshiarpur.
3. verse 101
4. verse 102
5. verse 14
6. *Sandeśe'smin katham api guruśrīpadāmbhojayugmadhyāna-dhvastaprabalatamasā vāsudevena baddhe.*
7. For instance *Mayūrasandeśa*, *Kokilasandeśa* etc.
8. *Kokasandeśa*, *Uninilisandeśa* etc..
9. Verses 1 and 2. 10 Verses 5 and 49.11. Verse 17.
12. Verse 6.
13. Verse 91. 14. Verse 89. 15. Verse 25.
16. Published in *Samvat* 2012
17. Some editions contain 101 verses only.
18. X-41, 57
19. It is only an imaginary name.
20. Verse 102, 103;
21. Verse 1 and 2;
22. *yadā yadā hi dharmasya..... Gītā*;
23. Verse
24. Verse 20.1
25. Verse 21.1
26. Verse 22.1
27. Verse 23.1
28. Verse 24-30.
29. Verse 3, 31.1
30. Verse 35.
31. Verse 38.
32. Verse 40.
33. Verse 42.

VIII

Sanskrit Language and Literature: A Study in Environment

For ages Indians have attached great importance to environment. There has been a family relationship of sorts between them and the flora and fauna around them. Śakuntalā, the heroine of Kālidāsa's immortal play the *Abhijñānaśākuntala*, had adopted a deer as her foster son whom she had brought up by offering a handful of black wild rice and nursed its wound by pouring Ingudi oil in its mouth when it got pierced with sharp blades of Kuśa grass. It is this deer which clung to her and pulled her garment, *atha ko 'yaṁ vasane me sajjate*, when she was proceeding to her husband's home:

*yasya tvayā vṛṇaviropanam ingudīnām
tailaṁ nyaṣicyata mukhe kuśasūcividdhe!
śyāmākamuṣṭiparivardhitako jahāti
so 'yaṁ na putrakṛtakāḥ padavīm mṛgas te' ॥¹*

The family was not restricted only to living beings; it extended even to inanimate things like trees with all their six varieties, the shrubs, the creepers, the climbers the winding plants (*vallī*), the bamboos (*tvaksāra*) and the reeds, the straw, the grass and other plantations in this category (*ṛṇajātī*). The *Mahābhārata* finds great virtue in planting them. The trees are the sons, says the great work, for one who plants them, *tasya putrā bhavanti* etc.,² and it is his bounden duty to look after them and bring them up, *putravat paripālyāś ca putrās te dharmataḥ smṛtāḥ*³. They serve the deities with shade. The Kinnaras, the serpents, the

demons, the celestial beings, the Gandharvas, the human beings—all depend upon them. With their flowers and fruits they satisfy the humankind. One who gifts them, they liberate in this world and the world beyond.

It is not only human beings who would adopt them as sons, even the gods would do so.

In the conversation between Dilīpa and lion in the *Raghuvamśa* the lion refers to a tree, the Devadāru, which had been adopted by Lord Śiva as His son with Goddess Pārvatī Herself watering it:

*amum purah paśyasi devadārum
putrikṛto 'sau vṛṣabhadhvajena
yo hemakumbhastananiḥsṛtānām
skandasya mātuh payasām rasajñah⁴॥*

When once a wild elephant while scratching its temple had rubbed it off its skin, Pārvatī was overpowered with grief much like the grief she had felt when her son Skanda was smitten all over with the missiles of the demons:

*kaṇḍūyamānena kaṣaṇ kadācid
vanyadvipenonmathitā tvag asya
athainam adres tanayā śuśoca
senānyam ālīḍham ivāsurāstraiḥ⁵॥*

It is in India that mountains and rivers have been accorded the character of divinity. The Himālaya is *devatātmā* here like the Gaṅgā, the Godāvarī, the Kāverī. The rivers are the means to salvation, *mokṣadāyikāḥ*, here. It is again here that trees and plants have been invested with divinity and are worshipped in all reverence. The Lord proclaims Aśvattha, the Peepul tree, as His own form: *aśvatthaḥ sarvavṛkṣāṇām*. It is said that one who plants five *āmras* (literally the word means a mango tree but in its extended meaning has come to denote a tree in general)-the five trees, does not go to hell. The trees are:

*aśvattha ekah picumarda eko
dvau campakau trīṇi ca kesarāṇi
sapṭātha tālā navanārikelāḥ
pañcāmraṇā narakam na yāsi⁶॥*

The enumeration is according to the *Tithitattva*. According to the *Varāhapurāṇa* it is:

*aśvattham ekaṁ picumardaṁ 'ekaṁ
nyagrodham ekaṁ daśa puṣpajātīḥ |
dve dve tathā dāḍimamātuliṅge
pañcāmrvavāpī narakam na yāti' ||*

The nature of the *āmras* as would be clear from the above differs, except for *aśvattha* and *picumarda*, in both the texts. While in the *Tithinirṇaya* they are *aśvattha*, *picumarda*, one each, two *campakas*, three *kesaras*, seven *tālas* (palm trees) and nine *nārikelas* (coconut trees), in the *Varāhapurāṇa* they are *aśvattha* and *picumarda*, one each, one *nyagrodha*, ten *puṣpajātis*, and *dāḍima* (pomegranate) and *mātuliṅga*, two each. The figure five, *pañca*, in the stanzas seems to be just indicatory, *upalakṣaṇa*. The number totals up, according to the first stanza to twenty three, according to the second one to seventeen. Anyway, what is significant here is the importance given to the plantation of the trees. Not to go to hell is the motivation mentioned here to prompt people, *prarocanā*, to go in for this which should weigh with them.

After planting, the trees have to be nurtured by watering. For watering also there is the incentive, the *prarocanā*, viz., satisfying the manes: *āmrās ca siktāḥ pitaraś ca prīṇitāḥ*, you water the *āmras* (trees) and satisfy the manes. Well, with one stroke you achieve two goals: *ekā kriyā dyarthakārī prasiddhā*⁸. What better than this?

It is also said that where there is grove of Tulasī plants, the repetition of the name of the Lord (Hari) and a congregation of His devotees, the Lord (Hari) is present there Himself:

*tulasīkānanam yatra hareḥ saṅkīrtanam tathā |
tadbhaktasamavāyaś ca tatra sannihito hariḥ ||*

The leaves of the mango, the *bilva* and the plantain trees are sacred to Indians. So are the coconut fruits, the betel leaf and the arecanut which serve as offering to gods. Of the types of grass or straw it is *kuśa* which steals the palm, its mats occupying the

pride of place in auspicious ceremonies. With so much holiness surrounding trees, plants, rivers, lakes, mountains, animals and birds it was unthinkable that Indians would countenance any damage to them.

They were conscious that while they need environment, the environment too needs them. The respect for nature and the concept of environmental harmony have been woven in Indian psyche through scriptures, religious codes and mythology. The ancient Indians understood and underscored the interrelatedness of their own selves and the Mother Nature. This idea gets expressed in Sanskrit literature in a telling manner. For instance, the *Mahābhārata* says that without a forest cover the tiger is slain, without a tiger the forest is felled. Hence a tiger should protect the forest and the forest should protect the tiger:

*nirvano vadhyate vyāghro nirvyāghram chidyate vanam |
tasmād vyāghro vanam rakṣed vanam vyāghram ca pālayet⁹ ||*

The entire approach of ancient Indians to environment was prompted by feeling of devotion, reverence, compassion and gratitude. This had helped them solve most of the environmental problems in a friendly manner. They wanted peace and harmony in every particle of environment as indicated by their plentiful prayers in that direction one of which, an oft-quoted one, from the *Atharvaveda* begs for peace on the earth, the mid-region, the waters, the herbs, the plants and so on, peace and peace everywhere: *om dyauḥ śāntir antarikṣam śāntiḥ pṛthivī śāntiḥ āpaḥ śāntiḥ oṣadhaḥ śāntiḥ¹⁰*.

The ancient seers of India have been holistic in their approach to existence. They had realized early enough the interdependence and the cooperation necessary among the forces of human and non-human nature.

It is an interesting fact that happenings with human beings would cast their shadow on the entire environment which reflected their mood in a mirror as it were. Śakuntalā's departure from the hermitage for her husband's home did not sadden her friends and foster father only. The female deer, the peacocks and the creepers too felt likewise:

*udgalitadarbhakavalā mṛgyaḥ parityaktanartanā mayūrāḥ |
apasṛtapāṇḍupatrā muñcanty āsrūṇīva latāḥ ||*¹¹

"The female deer vomitted the morsel of *kuśa* grass, the peacocks gave up dancing. The creepers with yellow (withered) leaves appear as if shedding tears".

The same is the response of the natural surroundings when Duṣyanta is overpowered with remorse for having repudiated Śakuntalā for no reason disbelieving all her pleadings for being his wife:

*cūtānām ciranirgatāpi kalikā badhnāti na svaṁ rajaḥ
saṁnaddham yad api sthitam kurabakam tat korakāvasthayā |
kañtheṣu skhalitam gate 'pi śiṣire puṁskokilānām rutam
śaṅke saṁharati smaro 'pi cakitas tūṇārdhakṛṣṭam śaram ||*¹²

"The bud of the mango, though long since burst forth, does not form (develop) its pollen; the *kurabaka*, although protruded, remains in the state of a bud; the cooing of the male-cuckoos falters in their throat, though winter has passed; meseems, even the God of Love puts back, in fear, his arrow half-drawn out of the quiver".

Just as a sad incident casts its shadow on the environment, in the same way happy one, even if yet to take place, provides cheer to it. With the birth of Raghu the quarters get brightened, the holy fire receives the oblations with its flame turning to the right and the pleasant breeze begins to blow:

*diśaḥ prasedur maruto vavuh sukḥāḥ
pradakṣiṇārcir havir agnir ādade ||*¹³

The same thing happened when Lord Buddha appeared on the earth. As a matter of fact, the omens—good or bad, are woven into the lives of the human beings which they affect and reflect. Whenever something bad is to happen to them like the death of a great personality, the defeat in a battle or visitation of a calamity the entire atmosphere comes to portend it: Dusty winds begin to blow, the light of the sun goes dim, the jackals begin to howl, the asses start baying, the owls begin to hoot, dogs start moaning, the dusky clouds appear in the sky. Sanskrit literature of all ages

is replete with such descriptions, the descriptions of bad omens, the *ghora nimittas* or the *viparītanimittas* (cf. *Gītā, nimittāni ca paśyāmi viparītāni keśava*)¹⁴.

In India the earth is accorded the status of mother. In the *Prthivīsūkta* of the *Atharvaveda* the *Rṣi* proclaims that he is the son of the earth: *mātā bhūmiḥ putro 'ham prthivyāḥ*. It is in India alone that forgiveness is begged of the earth for setting foot on it, the mother, the adored and the revered:

samudraraśane devi parvatastanamaṇḍite

*viṣṇupatni namas tubhyaṁ pādakṣepaṁ kṣamasva me*¹⁵

The same kind of forgiveness is begged of a tree by a carpenter for felling and sawing it for the wood needed for fashioning doors and windows of a house:

yāniha bhūtāni vasanti tāni

balim grhītvā vidhivat prayuktam

anyatra vāsam parikalpayantu

*kṣamantu te cādya namo 'stu tebhyaḥ*¹⁶

While referring to the earth it will not be out of point to make a reference to an episode where it figures with environmental overtones. Once while King *Prthu* was on the throne the earth went to *Brahmā* and complained to Him that the king was tormenting her. On being summoned, the king told the Lord that he was doing so because the earth was not yielding sufficient food for his subjects. In self-defence the earth said that it was so because the subjects had far too much exploited her upper crust with the result that her productivity had declined. *Brahmā* then asked the earth to assume the form of a cow and supply the milk (the remainder of it after the calf had sucked) to the subjects to hold on. This went on well for some time after which *Prthu* went to *Brahmā* and told him that his subjects were feeling uneasy; they wanted shelter now. *Brahmā* advised that they could dig into the earth for putting up pillars for building house but then the digging has to be done gently without hurting the earth too much. The Lord also advised the earth to withstand the hurt caused to her by digging and pounding. The above episode exemplifies the

concern of the ancient Indians to soil erosion that is what the loss of the upper crust is, a fact to which the present-day agricultural experts and environmentalists are drawing pointed attention. Further, indiscriminate digging and pounding, and that too deep, is certain to cause upheaval in the ecology which could be detrimental to the natural state of the earth.

There is an intimate connection of trees with human beings. The very idea of *dohada*, the desire of plants at budding time, owes itself to it. Certain trees like *Aśoka* flower when kicked by young ladies, *Bakula* when sprinkled by mouthfuls of liquor by the same, the *Karṇikāra* when touched by them. The Sanskrit literature is full of references to such phenomena, the poets often describing them in all their vividness. Connected with the natural phenomena reflecting the mood of a human being is the fact that it is the natural phenomena that not unoften influence the mood of a human being.

While speaking of colour it may not be out of place to mention that the coming together of the contrasting colours of black and white is taken in Indian tradition to have an impact in adding to the attractiveness, particularly in the case of women who have white complexion. Sanskrit literature is full of several instances of the same; *Rāma* was dark, *Sitā* was white; *Kṛṣṇa* was dark, *Rādhā* was white. Pointing to the dark-complexioned *Pāṇḍyan* king the ruler of *Uragapura* in the South as a possible choice for *Indumatī* the *Vidarbha* princess of white complexion, her friend *Sunandā* who was taking her from one prince to the other, says that should she choose him, their union could be like that of the cloud and the lightning: *saṅgas tadittodayadayaḥ ivāstu*¹⁷. Apiece with the above is the description of the coming together of the white waters of the *Gaṅgā* and the dark ones of the *Yamunā* at their confluence at *Prayāga*.

The Indians accept this creation to be made up of the *Pañcamahābhūtas*, the Five Great Elements, *Ṛthivī*, *Ap*, *Tejas*, *Vāyu*, and *Ākāśa*, the earth, water, fire, wind and ether. For its (creation's) well-being perfect equilibrium in them is necessary. Prayers were offered to this end in ancient India.

It was an ancient custom which some families still observe to set aside five morsels, *pañcagrāsas* as offerings to *Pañcamahābhūtas* before partaking of food. These morsels would go to crows and other birds who would feast on them. The society would thus help these creatures with the necessary wherewithal to survive, they being as much an essential part of it as anything else.

There has never been a systematic attempt to eliminate the birds of prey like eagles or vultures as at present. They are the nature's scavengers preying upon cremation or burial or just unclaimed bodies or the bodies of the mendicants which are outside the purview of cremation as per the custom for them and are just to be left as they are with no obsequies even in societies like those of the Hindus, the Jains, the Buddhists which otherwise, in the case of the laity, cremate them. There was a news item recently that the absence of these birds in some places had created a problem for the municipal authorities for the disposal of the dead bodies of the animals with the near total absence of these birds of prey.

It is not sheer mythology that eagles like *Jaṭāyu* and *Sampāti* were friends of *Daśaratha*. The friendship between human beings and the most ferocious of animals and birds is not an impossibility. It is this friendship that would have prompted *Jaṭāyu*, a *grdhra*, an eagle, to stake its life for the sake of *Sītā*, the daughter-in-law of its friend *Daśaratha*.

The interdependence of the human existence and the other creatures can be better illustrated by a belief prevalent among Indians, assiduously fostered and nurtured by astrologers that malefic effect of certain stars and planets in the horoscopes of certain individuals can be mitigated by daily offerings of grains like millets (*Bājra*) or maize to birds and wheat flour to insects, a common sight in Indian parks, roads or streets or parapets. The practice springs from the belief that these offerings going to these creatures would intercede on their behalf with the adverse effect of the planetary position to make it more malleable. Whatever the basis of the belief, it did help sustain the upkeep of the non-

human creatures by impelling the humans to help them survive even with the selfish motive of helping themselves. This was an indirect and a very ingenious way of emphasizing interdependence; the non-human creatures helping the humans; in reducing the impact of their impending adversity and the humans responding to this by offering food.

Life in India had been so intimately connected with nature, the flowers, the leaves, the trees, the birds, the animals that a large corpus of words have come to be connected with it. In them the natural phenomena serve as standards of comparison. Quite a few of the idioms and proverbs owe their origin to the association with them. It would be a subject for a Ph.D. or D.Litt. Thesis to gather such words and expressions from Sanskrit literature to show as to how what human beings see and experience around them gets embossed on their psyche.

Of the flowers the Indians were most familiar with and for which perhaps there was great fascination is lotus. Even though immersed in mud, *pañka*, it remains unsoiled with it investing it with exceptional beauty and sacredness. It's becoming symbolic of exceptional beauty and charm are indicative of good luck. It is accorded the special position of springing forth from the navel of Viṣṇu. Serving as the seat or the pedestal for Lakṣmī, Lord Viṣṇu holds it in one of His hands. So does Padmapāñi, one of the forms of the Lord Buddha. One of the sacred texts of the Buddhists goes by the name of *Lotus Sutra*.

For expressing the beauty, the charm, the delicacy of the limbs of the human body like the eyes, the hands, the feet, the face it is lotus which is pressed into service. We have such expressions as *netrakamala*, *ambujalocana*, *kamalalocana* (*pañīyaṃ pātum icchāmi tvattaḥ kamalalocane*), *karakamala*, *caraṇakamala*, *pādāmbuja*, *pādapañkaja*. The light dark complexion finds its comparison in the name of the blue lotus *nīlāmbujaśyāmalakomalāṅgam*. The languor of the beloved is compared to a lotus stalk in a state of blooming and non-blooming in a cloudy day: *sābhre 'hnīva sthalakamlinīm na prabuddhām na sūptām*. Coming back to the eyes we find them often enough

expressed with reference to fish, *mīna*, *mīnākṣī* or deer, *hariṇākṣī*: *hāro 'yaṁ hariṇākṣīṇāṁ luṭhati stanamaṇḍale* or the young one of the deer: *mṛgaśāvākṣī* or the lotus leaf, *kamalapatrākṣī*, *padmapalāśākṣī*. The elegant gait is expressed through swan, *hamsagati*; the leisurely one through elephant: *gajagāminī*. The melodious voice finds its parallel in the cooing of the cuckoo and dance through that of peacock. Looking back while moving on is *siṁhāvalokana*. The overall view is *vihaṅgāvalokana*. For expressing the deeds of a halfwicked person, *khala*, mosquito is the example: *sarvaṁ khalasya caritaṁ maśakaḥ karoti*. It is a dog which is an example for one who demeans himself for a pittance and an elephant for one who shows his dignity in accepting the offer, *bhumau nipatya vadanodara-darśanaṁ ca śvā piṇḍadasya kurute gajapuṅgavas tu dhīraṁ vilokayati cāṭusataiś ca bhuṅkte*.

The word *puṅgava*, bull is not limited to depict excellence in human beings only. It is extended to cover even the animals. The part of the stanza quoted speaks of *gajapuṅgava*, the elephant-bull to describe the best among the species.

A *Mahābhārata* stanza has a full horde of animals, birds and reptiles to serve as examples for a king to mould his actions. He is advised to have an eye of an eagle, the stillness of a crane, the action of a dog, the push of a lion, the suspiciousness of a crow and in all equanimity act like a snake:

*grdhradr̥ṣṭiḥ bakātinah śvaceṣṭah siṁhavikramah |
anudvignaḥ kākaśaṅkī bhujāṅgacaritaṁ caret ||¹⁸*

For highlighting the qualities of human beings it is the animals, birds and insects more often than not that come in handy to Sanskritists. A brave man or a man pre-eminent of a class is *narasiṁha* or *puruṣasiṁha* (*udyogināṁ puruṣasiṁham upaiti laskṣmīḥ*) *naravyāghra* or *naraśārdūla* (*uttiṣṭha naraśārdūla*) man-tiger, a man with large feet is termed *vyāghrapāda*. The excellence is expressed by different words for a bull: *vṛṣa* or *vṛṣabha*: *prācetaso munivṛṣā vṛṣabhaḥ kavinām*, *prācetaso* the best of the sages and the best of the poets; or *ṛṣabha*, *naraṛṣabha* or *puṅgava* : *narapuṅgava*, the best of the men, *paṇḍitapuṅgava*, the foremost among the learned. For deceit and chicanery it is

baka, a crane which is pressed into service, that being taken to be the ultimate in cunning and craft, *haitukān bakavṛttīṣ ca vaṇmātreṇāpi nārcayet*. Of the other birds *dhvāṅkṣa* or crow has become symbolic of a very greedy person, the type one would usually come across in a place of pilgrimage like the Paṇḍas, *tīrthakāka*, *tīrthadhvāṅkṣa*. The buoyed up happy mind is the joyful peacock, the *manomayūra*. Coming to the insects it is the *bhramara*, the bee (the word is so frequently used in Sanskrit that it has become the source of the origination of another word for bee, the *dvirepha*, the word *bhramara* having two rephas, *r* sounds in it) which steals the show. With some other words for it (the bee), *bhr̥ṅga* and *cañcarīka* with *kamala* or *abja* it is used to express total devotion, dedication : *pādābjabhṛṅga*, *caraṇakamala-cañcarīka*. In still another word for it (the bee), *madhukara*, it is pressed into service to denote fickleness. And so goes on the list endless.

The animals, the birds, the reptiles and the insects have not only served to highlight the qualities of human beings, they have also served as the types to determine the rhythmic movement of their poetry. The best indicators for this are the very names of some of the metres, the *Śārdūlalalita* and the *Śārdūlavikrīḍita*, the play of a tiger, *Bhujāṅgaprayāta*, the crawling of a snake, *Bhramaravilasita*, the hovering of a bee, *Gajagati*, the gait of an elephant, *Mattamayūra*, the intoxicated peacock, *Kalahamṣa*, the swan, *Hariṇī*, the female deer, *Hariṇapluta*, the jumping of a deer.

People in India in the very early period were conscious of maintaining environmental hygiene. The scriptures enjoin on one not to urinate or defecate or spit in water and for maintaining social norm, not to have bath naked.

Keeping the environment clean and not to pollute it is also the message of the well-known episode of the suppression of *Kāliya*, the *Kāliyadamana*. People of Mathurā had repaired to *Kṛṣṇa* to report to him that the serpent, the *nāga*, was polluting the *Yamunā* by discharging its venom into it and making it unfit for use, the *raison d'etra* of the latter in killing it. The episode signifies nothing but an attempt to save the *Yamunā* from pollution.

A large proportion of Sanskrit words shows connection of the people with animals highlighting their intimate association with their form and figure, their manners, their habitation and so on. The cow being at the centre of most of their physical and spiritual needs, the nourishing milk, yoghurt and ghee, the last one being the most important ingredient of material for a sacrifice, more words are connected with the same. A window or a ventilator is *gavākṣa*, literally the eye of a cow, so called because of its being of that shape. The grape because of its resemblance in shape with the teats of a cow gets the name *gostanī*. For an assembly or a get-together the word is *goṣṭhī*, literally the place where the cows gather (a cow-pen), the sense getting transformed from the special to the general one of a gathering of human beings. Gomukha, a kind of musical instrument is so called because of its shape of the mouth of a cow, *goruta* is a measure of distance equal to two *krośas*, literally the sound (bleating) of a cow. Since it could be heard from a long distance, it has come to signify that distance itself.

A large corpus of *nyāyas* or illustrations in support of Śāstric principles are based on the behaviour of animals or birds like the *aviravika nyāya*, one sheep following the other blindly (even if it were merely a coincidence that the first sheep took to a particular track), *khalekapotanyāya*, the pigeons flocking to the place of the spread out grains, *andhacaṭakanyāya* the blind man catching a sparrow, *ghuṇākṣaranyāya*, a chance or a fortuitous occurrence (the words or letters appearing on a leaf incised by the insect *ghuṇa*); *kadambāgolakanyāya*, the *kadamba* buds appearing simultaneously, a simultaneous rise or action; *kākatālīyanyāya*, a chance or an accidental occurrence as would happen if the palm fruit falls with a crow sitting on the tree and breaks the head of the wayfarer resting under it; *kākadantagaveṣaṇanyāya*, a useless or unprofitable act like the searching after the teeth of a crow; *viṣakṛmīnyāya*, the worms bred in poison, a state of things which though fatal to others is not so to those who are bred in it, *viṣavrkṣanyāya* the maxim of the poisonous tree, planted by oneself not deserving of severing, used

to denote the idea of not causing harm or hurt to a person, even though harmful, if one has himself brought him up and so on.

There has been so much of interaction between an Indian man and his environment that both have become intertwined with each other. The Sanskrit vocabulary is a testimony to it. It embodies the entire gamut of Indian mental make-up. Just a peep into it the present study seeks to attempt.

REFERENCES

1. *Abhijñānaśākuntala*, IV. 14.
2. *Anuśāsanaparvan*, 58. 27.
3. *ibid.*, 58.31.
4. *Raghuvamśa*, II. 6.
5. *ibid.*, II. 37.
6. *Śabdakalpadruma*.
7. *ibid.*
8. A stanza well-known in Sanskrit circles. Its source, however, is not traceable.
9. *Mahābhārata*, Udyogaparvan, 29.25.
10. *Atharvaveda*, 19.9.14.
11. *Abhijñānaśākuntala*, IV. 12.
12. *ibid.*, VI.4.
13. *Raghuvamśa*, III.14.
14. I.31.
15. *Brahmanityakarmasamuccaya*, Bombay, Śaṁvat 2034, p. 2.
16. *Bṛhadvastumālā*, Varanasi, Śaṁvat 2018, p. 40.
17. *Raghuvamśa*, VI. 65.
18. *Śāntiparvan*, 140.62.

IX

Contribution of Muslims to Sanskrit

In Medieval Period

The Hindu sciences were known to the Arabs before the advent of Islam. Indian drugs and spices were imported into Arabia in large quantities and the Quraish of Mecca handled this trade and came into frequent contact with India. Al-Haritha, an Arab physician and a contemporary of the Prophet, travelled to India where he probably studied Āyurveda. The Sanskrit language was probably properly introduced to the Muslim world when the Caliphate was transferred from Damascus to Baghdad in the second quarter of the Hijra (750 A.D.) and the Abbasids came to power. The well-known book on Astronomy, the *Sūryasiddhānta*, was translated from Sanskrit into Arabic by the command of the Caliph al-Mansur. Ibrahim al-Fazari and Yaqub B. Tariq did the translation with the help of a Pandit whose name is not preserved. During the same period a large number of Sanskrit medical works were translated into Arabic. The most important among them was the *Book of Shanāq* (Cāṇakya). The Arabs were greatly influenced by this book and by the ideas of Indians on toxicology. Jahiz Ibn Abi Usaybiyah and Ibn al-Nadim have given the names of a large number of Hindu scholars who were teaching Sanskrit to the

Dr. K. Nath Memorial Lecture at the Constitution Club, New Delhi on May 5, 1977 under the auspices of the Institute of Indology, New Delhi. Chair : His Excellency Dr. B.D. Jatti, the Acting President of India. Chief Guest : Padmabhushan Suraj Bhan, Vice-Chancellor, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

Arabs and helping Muslim scholars in translating Sanskrit works into Arabic.

The association of Muslims begun under Caliph al-Mansur reached its zenith under Sultan Mahmud of Ghazni whose armies carried away al-Biruni from Kharzim to Ghazni in 1018 A.D. A profound scholar of Greek, Roman and the ancient Iranian sciences, Abu Raihan B. Ahmad al-Biruni was the first Muslim scientist who came to India in the vanguard of Mahmud's armies and who stayed on in the country to study Indian sciences and Hindu wisdom.

Al-Biruni not only learnt Sanskrit and read Hindu classics, such as the Purāṇas and the *Bhagavadgītā*, but also studied Hindu astronomy, mathematics, chronology, mathematical geography, physics, chemistry and minerology. After this preparation he wrote his monumental history *Tahqiq Ma Lil Hind*.

Al-Biruni translated not only Patañjali's *Yogasūtras*, Īśvarakṛṣṇa's *Sāṃkhyakārikā* and Varāhamihira's *Brhatsamhitā* and *Laghujātaka* into Arabic, but also translated Euclid's *Elements* and Ptolemy's *Almagest* into Sanskrit. During Sultanate period Amir Khusrau continued the great tradition of al-Biruni. During the same period Abdul Aziz Shams Lahauri translated the *Brhatsamhitā*. Another Muslim scholar whose name has been lost translated the *Amṛtakunḍa* into Persian under the command of Alauddin Khilji.

One of the oldest languages of the world, Sanskrit has grown and developed in India over the past thousands of years. Its literature consists of some of the finest specimens of human creation. It has been enriched by people of different cultural and ethnic groups, different religious and social backgrounds, different linguistic and speech habits. It is Indian in the true sense of the term, not possible to be associated with any particular community or group of people. Still in popular notion it has come to be associated with the Hindus just as Persian and Urdu have come to be associated with the Muslims. It is to remove this erroneous notion, arisen in all probability from lack of adequate information, that the present exercise is being undertaken.

It may in passing be pointed out here that there is a basic difference between the condition of Sanskrit and that of Persian/Urdu. The latter have been after the introduction of Islam in India for almost a thousand years the languages of the Muslim rulers enjoying the privilege of being the languages of State. If the Hindus took to them, they did so in all probability for gaining an access to the ruling class with all its attendant advantages. Again, these two languages, Persian and Urdu, were spoken at least by an important section. There was no such outward advantage with Sanskrit. If in spite of this, non-Hindus, the Muslims in particular, patronized it, studied it and interpreted its vast literary wealth, they did so for the mere love of it. They were probably so deeply impressed with its charm, its sweetness, its rhythm and its richness that they thought to drink deep at its fountain-head, either directly or through translations.

It has been the special characteristic of the country that two parallel planes have continued to exist in it side by side. While on the actual plane it has accepted distinctions of caste and creed, on the intellectual plane it has discarded them, resulting in its development, in spite of a multiplicity of castes and creeds in it, as a haven of peaceful co-existence. There has as a consequence been a good deal of give and take between castes and castes and communities and communities. The quest of knowledge for the realization of the Supreme has been common to all the inhabitants of this ancient land. Any pious person or a spiritual leader would find adherents in it from all communities—Hindus, Muslims and Christians. It was in this country that Andal, a woman of low caste could win the veneration of the Alvars in the South. It was in this country again that the work of Pariahs like Thirupam could secure recognition from such stalwarts as Rāmānuja. The religious leaders who influenced large sections of society in their times like Caitanya of Bengal, Śaṅkaradeva of Assam, Tukārām of Maharashtra, Nānak of Punjab, to mention only a few, did not believe in the distinctions of caste and community and had among their adherents both Hindus and Muslims. As a more telling instance of this could be mentioned Rāmānanda who had

Ravidāsa a shoe-maker, Kabir a Mohammedan weaver and Senā, a barber, among his disciples. Communal harmony was therefore ingrained in the very thinking of the country which had evolved itself along higher paths over the centuries. That is why the two principal communities in it, though maintaining their separate identity and following their separate religious practices, have achieved a kind of fusion that defies all description. Hindus visit Muslim saints and their Dargāhs and offer prayers. The Muslim saint Saiyad Ali-al Hujwiri is as much honoured by the Muslims as the Hindus. The same can be said of the disciples of Muinuddin Chishti and many others. It is again because of this that the Hussaini Brahmins of Rajasthan are found following Mohammedan practices, though adhering at the same time to Hindu rituals and customs. It is again due to this that the Imam Shahi sect of the Muslims is seen following the authority of the *Atharvaveda* and of Nīskalāṅka. And it is due to this again that most of the Sufi saints like Nizamuddin Aulia, Fariduddin Shakarganj, Shah Inayat Shah Kalandar were initiated by Hindu spiritual leaders.

With such give and take among the Hindus and Muslims it was but natural for them to feel attracted towards the languages and the literatures of each other.

In the medieval period arts and letters flourished under the patronage of rulers. If royal or official patronage had not been available to Sanskrit it would not have flourished to the extent it did. Many of the rulers of the period, especially the Mughals, and some of the high officials working under them extended their patronage to it. Of the Sanskrit writers patronized by them could be mentioned Bhānukara, Akabariya Kālidāsa, Puṇḍarika Viṭṭhala, Gaṅgādhara, Kṛṣṇa, Rudrakavi, Jagannātha Paṇḍita-rāja, Vedāṅgarāya, Amṛtadatta, Harinārāyaṇa Miśra, Vaṃśīdhara, Lakṣmīpati and so on.

Bhānukara or Bhānudatta enjoyed the patronage of emperor Sher Shah whom he eulogizes in one of his verses.

He also eulogizes Nizam Shah, identified with Burhan Shah of the Nizam Shahi dynasty, who ruled from 1510-1515 A.D. He

was the author of eight works two of which are commentaries on his own writings.

One of the greatest of the poets of the 16th Century A.D. Akabariya Kālidāsa, as his very name shows, was indebted to Akbar for his patronage to him, which had probably prompted him to go in for this peculiar name which was his pseudonym, his original name being Govindabhaṭṭa. In his quite a few verses preserved in the anthologies he speaks of a number of kings of his time such as Rāmacandra of Rewa, who sent Tansen to Akbar's court, a king of Gurjara, Gurjarendra, King Jallala, a Vaghela king and one Dalapati.

Emperor Akbar was a great lover of literature and a number of Sanskrit poets, scholars and men of letters enjoyed his patronage. Bhānucandra and his disciple Siddhacandra wrote an exhaustive commentary on the *Kādambarī*. Bhānucandra, as he himself says in the prefatory verses, was Akbar's favourite: *akabbarakṣmāpatidattamānaḥ*.

Rāmacandra wrote *Rāmaṇḍa* an astronomical work in Sanskrit for Rāmadāsa Bhūpāla, a minister of Akbar, which gives his (Akbar's) full genealogy. His brother Nīlakaṇṭha wrote *Toḍarānanda*, a work on Civil Law, Astronomy and Medicine for Todarmal, one of Akbar's ministers.

Behari Krishna Das wrote a work *Pārasīprakāśa* which, as the author himself states, was composed for the pleasure of Akbar: *akabaranṇparucyartham*, so were composed the work *Nītisāra* and *Nartananirṇaya* on music, dancing and so on by Gaṅgādhara and Puṇḍarika Viṭṭhala respectively.

As was Akbar so were his son Jehangir and grandson Shah Jehan. In the former's reign a scholar Śrīkṛṣṇa in whom he placed great confidence wrote *Bījanavāṅkura*, a commentary on Bhāskarācārya's Algebra and a poet Rudrakavi wrote three works, the *Kīrtisamullāsa*, and the *Dānāśāhcarita* on emperor Jehangir, on the emperor's son prince Khurram and Akbar's son prince Danyal. In the latter's reign there flourished a number of Sanskrit poets and scholars, the most prominent of them being Paṇḍitarāja Jagannātha who wrote a number of works like the

Rasagaṅgādhara, the *Bhāminīvilāsa*, the *Gaṅgālaharī* and so on and who spent quite a few of his earlier years under his benevolent patronage: *dillīvallabhapāṇipallavatale nītaṁ navīnaṁ vayah*, having been invited to his court when his fame had spread with the defeat by him of a Jaipurian Kazi at the disquisition concerning Islam. In a verse ascribed to him he praises the munificence of the lord of Delhi or the emperor. According to him it is either the lord of Delhi or the Lord of the universe who can fulfil people's desires:

dillīśvaro vā jagadīśvaro vā manorathān pūrayitum samarthah.

Of the gifts by other kings, he says: (They are too tiny), they can procure for us a vegetable or a pinch of salt in a meal:

anyair nrpālaih paridīyamānaṁ śākāya vā syāl lavaṇāya vā syāt.

According to a tradition he married a Muslim girl, Lavāṅgī. He enjoyed Shah Jehan's patronage in full. It was he who conferred on him the title of *Paṇḍitarāja* for his *Āsafavilāsa*, a work written by him in praise of Nawab Asaf Khan, brother of Nur Jehan and the minister of Shah Jehan: *sārvabhauma-śrīśāhajahān-prasādādhigatapaṇḍitarājapadavīvirājitenā...* He is said to have left Delhi after the death of Dara Shikoh whom he greatly admired for his learning.

Among other writers of Shah Jehan's reign mention may be made of Munīśvara who wrote the *Siddhāntasārvabhauma* also called *Siddhāntatattvārtha*, a versified compendium of theoretical astronomy, *Nirṣṭārthadūtī*, a commentary on the well-known mathematical work the *Līlāvati* and *Marīci*, a commentary on the *Gaṇitādhyāya* and the *Golādhyāya* of Bhāskara's *Siddhānta-śiromaṇi* besides a small work, the *Pāṭisāra*; Bhagavatīsvāmin who wrote *Kāvyaavṛttiprabhoda* a treatise on metres used in *Kāvya*s; Nityānanda who wrote two works on astronomy the *Sarvasiddhāntarāja* and *Siddhāntasindhu*, the latter at the instance of Asaf Khan, the minister of Shah Jehan: so 'yam vāsafakhānī vibhāti sakalān varṇāśramān pālayan tasya preranayā; Vedāṅgarāya who wrote a number of astronomical and religious

treatises, the more prominent of them being the *Pārasīprakāśa*, dealing with the methods of conversion of the Hindu dates into Mohammedan and vice versa and Arabic and Persian names of the week, the months, the plants, the constellations and so on, which he wrote to please the emperor and gain his favour:

śrīmacchāhajahānīmahendraparamaprītiprasādāptaye

Harinārāyaṇa Miśra no work of whom has come down to us except the two verses in the anthologies in one of which he praises his patron, the emperor Shah Jehan. It is interesting to note that it was not only the emperor who patronised Sanskrit scholars, his queen Mumtaz Mahal too did the same. Vamśīdhara Miśra, a Sanskrit poet of note, enjoyed her patronage. The anthology, the *Padyāmṛtatarangīnī* records a verse by him. There appears to have been a rivalry between the two great contemporaries Paṇḍitarāja Jagannātha who enjoyed the favour of the emperor and Vamśīdhara Miśra who enjoyed the favour of the queen. The said anthology has a verse by the Paṇḍitarāja too. Both the poets through a verse each are interpreted to have a dig at each other.

The Paṇḍitarāja says that he does not find an elephant anywhere near him, not to speak of a lion, on whom he could show his prowess:

*digante śrūyante madamalinagaṇḍāḥ karaṭīnaḥ
karīṇyaḥ kārūṇyāspadam asamaśīlāḥ khalu mṛgāḥ
idānīm loke 'sminn anupamaśikhānām punar ayaṁ
nakhānām pāṇḍityaṁ prakaṭayatu kasmin mṛgapatīḥ॥*

"The elephants with their temples soiled with ichor, it is heard, are at the end of the quarters, the she-elephants are an object of pity, the deer are no match in bearing. On what now in the world is the lion to show the skill of its claws with matchless rays of light?"

Vamśīdhara Miśra says that the favourite of Mahādeva (oblique reference to Shah Jehan) is a bull. The favourite of Durgā (oblique reference to Mumtaz Mahal) is a lion. Since it enjoys Her favour (meaning that since he enjoys Mumtaz's favour) it does not find any body to test its prowess; not even the Śiva's

bull, (meaning Paṇḍitarāja Jagannātha who enjoys Shah Jehan's favour, Śiva being taken as symbolic of him) for that is a bull after all:

*dinnāgāḥ pratipedire prathamato jātyaiva jetavyatām
sambhāvyasphuṭavikramo 'tha vṛṣabho gaur eva gaurīpateḥ
vikrānter nikaṣaṁ karotu katamaṁ nāma trilokītale
kaṇṭhekālakuṭumbinīkaruṇayā siktāḥ sa kaṇṭhīravaḥ*

"The quarter elephants being in the species that they are accepted that they were conquerable, the bull of Śiva which could be supposed to have visible valour is (after all) a bull, To what should a lion drenched with the mercy of the consort of Śiva (= Pārvatī) is to turn to serve as touchstone to its valour?"

Not only the Mughals, other Muslim rulers or noblemen or officers too extended patronage to Sanskrit scholars and writers of their time.

King Shahabuddin, in all probability a ruler of Kashmir, had in Amṛtadatta a court poet in Sanskrit who recorded the fact of the despatch of a message by him (Shahabuddin) to one Mir asking him to desist from invading Kashmir.

King Burhan Shah of the Faruqi dynasty which ruled between 1320-1600 A.D. at Anandavalli at Khandesh had in Puṇḍarīka Viṭṭhala, a writer of repute, who concentrated on writing on music in Sanskrit at his court. Viṭṭhala later shifted to the court of Madhava Singh of the Kacchapa dynasty at whose instance he composed the well-known work on music the *Rāgamañjarī*. He was also a favourite of Akbar, the Great.

Shayesta Khan, Aurangzeb's maternal uncle and general had in Caturbhujā, a poet and a rhetorician like Paṇḍitarāja Jagannātha. He composed the poem *Rasakalpadruma* in glorification of his patron.

Lakṣmīpati, a poet of the 17th cen. A.D., flourished during the reign of Aurangzeb's son Muhammed Shah the life-story of whose minister Abdullah he poetizes in his work, the *Abdullācarita*.

There is an old work called *Udbhaṭasāgara* (of unknown date) which has a verse that looks like having been composed by

an anonymous Hindu poet as should be evident from the expression of disgust by invoking Lord Śiva where the lack of devoutness among both Hindus and Muslims is decried:

*na sandhyām sandhatte na niyamitanamājān prakurute
na vā mauñjibandham kalayati na vā sunnatavidhim ।
na rojām jānīte vratam api harer naiva kurute
na kāśi makkā vā śiva śiva na hindur na yavanaḥ ॥*

“Does not perform morning, noon and evening prayers, nor Namaz, does not wear girdle nor has undergone Sunnat; has no idea of Roza; does not go in for the austerities going with Hari; there is no Kāśi for him nor Mecca; he is neither a Hindu nor a Muslim”.

The Muslim rulers and the noblemen not only extended patronage to Sanskrit by admitting Sanskrit poets and writers of eminence to their courts, providing them with all incentive and encouragement by honouring them and giving them help, financial or otherwise, to enable them to carry on their literary activities unhampered, they also extended patronage to Sanskrit by arranging for the translations of the classics into it. They were actuated herein by the desire to make this vast wealth of knowledge available to their co-religionists who had to have a thorough acquaintance with Sanskrit before they could execute their assignments. It is through their efforts that the translations into Persian of such works as the *Rāmāyaṇa*, the *Mahābhārata*, the *Bhāgavata-purāṇa* and so on were undertaken and brought successfully to completion. It is interesting to note that at the instance of Akbar the translation into Persian of the *Rāmāyaṇa* and the *Mahābhārata* was undertaken. The *Rāmāyaṇa* was translated again during Jahangir's reign by Mulla Sadullah Masih. Sadullah spent twelve years in Varanasi studying Sanskrit.

It was Akbar's great grandson, the learned prince Dara Shikoh, who carried out the translation into Persian of the Upaniṣads under the title *Sirr-ul-Akbar*. He also translated the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* into Persian. Among his original compositions may be mentioned the *Samudrasaṅgama* on the technical terms of Hindu pantheism and Sufi phraseology and *Mukalamah-i-Baba*

Lal Das, a dialogue between himself and Baba Lal Das in the course of which he dealt with the ideals of Hinduism. An interesting fact that bears reproduction here is that a condensed version of the *Mahābhārata* under the title *Razmnamah*, Book of War, was prepared under orders of Akbar. It was richly decorated with pictures. For its manuscript alone Akbar spent an amount equal to some 40,000 dollars. Abul Fazl contributed the preface to it and its copies were distributed under royal orders to nobles. Among other notable translations of Sanskrit works into Persian, under orders of Muslim kings, mention may be made of the *Atharvaveda* first by a converted Mohammedan of the South Abdul Quadir who could not complete it and later by Haji Ibrahim Sarhindi; the mathematical work, the *Līlāvati*, by Faizi; the astronomical work, the *Karṇābharaṇa*, under the title *Gurraṭ-i-viz-Zijat* by al-Biruni; the astronomical work *Tājaka* by Muquammal Khan Gujarati; the historical work, the *Rājatarāṅgiṇī* by Maulana Imamuddin; the *Harivaṃśa* by Nasarulla Mustafa; the *Pañcatantra* under the title *Kalilah Damnah* by Maulana Hussain Waiz. An easier adaptation of the last was also attempted under the title *Ayar Danish*. The Naladamayanti story was rendered into Persian under the title *Naldaman*. The *Dvātrīṃśatputtalikāsimhāsana* was translated into Persian by Abdul Quadir with the help of a learned Pandit under the title *Khīrad Afza-Namah*. The *Gaṅgādhara* and the *Maheśamahānanda* were translated under the general supervision of Abul Fazl.

Aurangzeb according to popular perception was opposed to music but it was during his reign that excellent Persian translations of two scholarly works on music were prepared. Faqirullah translated the *Rāgadarpaṇa* while Mirza Rawshan Zamir translated the *Saṅgītapārijāta*. Mirza Fakhruddin compiled a book on Hindu literature and sciences titled *Tuhfatul Hind* (The Gift of India).

During the twilight of the Mughals the Muslims produced two great scholars of Sanskrit, Sirajuddin Ali Khan and Ghulam Ali Azad Bilgiramī. The latter wrote a book extolling the beauties of Sanskrit literature comparing them with Arabic rhetoric.

When Nadir Shah left India after looting and plunder he took with him not only jewels, gold and silver but also a hundred and thirty writers.

The first Bengali translation of the *Mahābhārata* was carried out under the orders of the Bengal ruler Nasir Shah (1282-1325 A.D.) to whom the well-known poet Vidyāpati dedicates one of his Padas. Similarly, emperor Hussain Shah was responsible for providing inspiration for the translation into Bengali of the *Bhāgavata-purāṇa*. His general Paragal Khan was equally devoted to Sanskrit learning. It was under his orders that Kavindra Paramēśvara translated the *Mahābhārata* upto the Strīparvan which was listened to every evening by himself and by the congregation of his courtiers in his palace. His son Chuti Khan encouraged Śrīkaranandin to undertake a translation of the Āśvamedhikaparvan of the *Mahābhārata* which he successfully brought to completion.

The Muslims were not only great patrons of Sanskrit learning, they, at least some of them, were good writers as well in the language. A few verses of Shayesta Khan, the maternal uncle of Aurangzeb, are found in a manuscript of Caturbhuja's *Rasakalpadruma* which is preserved in Alwar Maharaja's Manuscript Library.

A more important Muslim composer in Sanskrit, however, is Nawab Abdul Rahim Khan-i-Khana, the noted literateur and the occupant of the highest post of Wakil under Akbar. He wrote nine works apart from preparing the Persian translation of the *Tuzk-i-Babari*, the autobiography of Babar in Turkish:

- (i) The *Dohāvalī*
- (ii) The *Nagara-śobhā*, a collection of 172 *Dohās*
- (iii) The *Barve Nāyikābheda*
- (iv) The *Barve*
- (v) The *Madanāṣṭaka*
- (vi) The *Phuṭakar pada*
- (vii) The *Śṛṅgārasorathā*
- (viii) The *Rahīma-kāvya* and
- (ix) The *Khetakautuka*, an astrological work.

Of these v, viii. and ix are in a mixed style, a commingling of Sanskrit and Persian/Arabic or Braj/Awadhi.

When the Mohammedans came to India from Arab lands and Iran they brought with them their languages, Arabic and Persian. For centuries these served as official languages. Later, due to local environments a local language with a preponderance of Arabic and Persian words under the name of Urdu came to replace them. Even while Arabic and Persian were the official languages of the Muslims, the local nobility continued to use Braj and Awadhi. Literary composition was predominantly carried out in them. Their beauty and grace attracted the Muslims too. They also took to them for their works. Sanskrit, though nowhere in the picture at the official or the popular level was by virtue of the vast fund of literature always on the side-lines. It could furnish to the literateurs of the period thoughts and images which they could incorporate in their works in their own media. A study of it was, therefore, considered useful for a high-quality literary production. It was this usefulness which prompted many a Muslim and Hindu writer of the medieval ages to take to its study. Creative writers, at least some of them, were attracted by its charm, its rhythm, its cadence, its richness. They started trying their hand at it. Alongwith it they continued with their own language, Urdu/Persian or Braj/Awadhi. Their writings, therefore, came to appear in all the three languages Persian/Urdu, Braj/Awadhi and Sanskrit. Sometimes they would write exclusively in Persian/Urdu or Braj/Awadhi or Sanskrit. The readers of the contemporary period could understand all of them. It created no difficulty if any one of them or all of them or any two of them were adopted in a composition. It would also prove the proficiency and the skill of the authors in different languages. This resulted in the emergence in the medieval ages of a literary style called the *Maṇipravāla* where one line in a couplet would be in Sanskrit and the other in Persian/Urdu or one line in Braj/Awadhi and the other in Persian/Urdu. The metre in each case would invariably be that of Sanskrit. Further, Persian or Arabic words would figure in a couplet with Sanskrit suffixes. The earliest example of this is found in the verses of poet *Lakṣmīpati*, as for example:

- (1) *sa naro gostanīm tyaktvā karoti gostabhakṣaṇam*
- (2) *yatas tato mayā 'nuktvā jaharam tyajyate vapuḥ*
- (3) *vajīreṣu ca yoṣitsu duṣmaṇī yair vidhīyate*
- (4) *phrāmosi na vidhātavyā baradāstaṁ vidhīyatām*

The above style has been followed as stated earlier in three of his works by Khan-i-Khana too. In a pure Sanskrit verse in the beginning of his *Kheṭakautuka* he says that he is following in the footsteps of earlier writers who composed their works with an admixture of Persian vocabulary:

*phārasīyapadamīśritagranthāḥ khalu paṇḍitaiḥ kṛtāḥ pūrvaiḥ |
samprāpya tatpadapatham karavāṇi kheṭakautukam padyaiḥ ||*

A verse from each of the three works of Khan-i-Khana where he employs the mixed style would suffice to give one an idea of it.

From the *Kheṭakautuka*:

*avvalakhāne yadā rāsaḥ khismanākaś ca kāhilaḥ |
manujaḥ svārthakartā syād bhaved bero tu jāhilaḥ ||*

"If Rāhu were to be in the Janmalagna, a person would remain unhappy, would be indolent, ugly, selfish, needlessly hostile and foolish."

From the *Rahīma-kāvya*:

*ekasmin divasāvasānasamaye main thā khaḍā bāga meṁ
kācit tatra kuraṅgabālanayanā gul toḍaī thī khaḍī |
tām drṣṭvā navayauvanām śaśimukhīm main moha meṁ jā paḍā
no jīvāmi vinā tvayā śṛṇu priye tū yāra kaise mile ||*

"One evening I went to a garden when a damsel with eyes like those of the young one of a deer was picking up flowers. When I spotted that young lady with a moonlike face I lost my consciousness. O my darling, listen, I can't live without you. How can I, O loved one, have you?"

From the *Madanāṣṭaka*:

*vigataghananiśīthe cāṇḍa kī rośanāī
saghanaghananikuñje kāṇha vaṁśī bajāī |
sutapatigatanidrāḥ svāmiyān choḍa bhāgīn
madana śīrasi bhūyaḥ kyā balā āna lāgīn ||*

“The moon was shining in the cloudless midnight. Kṛṣṇa played on the flute in a thick bower. The Gopīs woke up and ran leaving their husbands and sons. O Cupid, what a great problem set on the head?”

Khan-i-Khana has not invariably followed the mixed style, he has written in pure Sanskrit also often times. A few of his Sanskrit verses are marked with intense spirituality and can easily steal the palm over similar compositions of the Vaiṣṇava saint-poets, e.g.,

*ahalyā pāṣāṇaḥ prakṛtipaśur āsīt kapiṇī
guha 'bhūc cāṇḍālas tritayam api nītaṁ nijapadam
aham cittenāśmā paśur api tavārcādikaraṇe
kriyābhiḥ cāṇḍālo raghuvara na mām uddharasi kim॥*

“Ahalyā was a stone. The army of monkeys was animal by nature. Guha was Cāṇḍāla. All of those three were taken by you to your abode. I am a stone in mind, an animal in offering you worship etc., and Cāṇḍāla in actions. O Rāma why don't you then come to my rescue?”

In the same strain is another verse of his that has gained wide currency in Sanskrit circles because of bringing out the absolute devotee in him to the point of total absorption of his thoughts in his Lord. In this he offers his own mind to the Lord, He being without it in Rādhā having taken it away:

*ratnākaro 'sti sadanaṁ gṛhiṇī ca padmā
kim deyam asti bhavate jagadīśvarāya
Rādhāgṛhīta-manase 'manase ca tubhyaṁ
dattaṁ mayā nijamanas tad idaṁ gṛhāna॥*

“The ocean, the repository of jewels, is thy abode. Padmā (Lakṣmī, the Goddess of Fortune) is thy wife. What is that which can be offered to thee, the Lord of the Universe? To thee who has lost His mind in Rādhā having carried it away I offer my own mind. Pray thou accept it”.

Tradition has it that once Jagannātha Triśūlī, a poet friend of Khan-i-Khana recited to him a couplet composed by him:

*prāpya calān adhikārān śatruṣu mitreṣu bandhuvargeṣu
nāpakṛtaṁ nopakṛtaṁ nopakṛtaṁ kim kṛtaṁ tena॥*

"If by getting into office, which is impermanent, one did not harm the enemies, or favour the friends, or honour the relations, what has one done?"

Khan-i-Khana quietly listened to it, changed only the Mātrā in the first syllable in the second hemistich and recited it back:

nopakṛtaṁ nopakṛtaṁ nopakṛtaṁ kiṁ kṛtaṁ tena||

What greatness! Even in the case of the enemies it should not be *apakṛtaṁ*, harm. It should be *upakṛtaṁ*, favour.

Khan-i-Khana also introduced the style of himself rendering

(i) some of his own verses

(ii) or those of earlier authors in Braj.

An instance of *i* is:

Sanskrit original:

*acyutacaraṇātaraṅgiṇī śaśīsekharāmaulimālatīmāle!
mama tanuvitarāṇasamaye haratā deyā na me haritā||*

Braj rendering:

*acyutacaraṇātaraṅginī śivasira mālatimāla!
hari na banāyo surasari kījo indava bhāla||*

An instance of *ii* is:

Sanskrit original:

*yācanā hi puruṣasya mahattvaṁ
nāśayaty akhilam eva tathā hi!
sadya eva bhagavān api viṣṇur
vāmano bhavati yācitum icchan||*

"Supplication takes away from a person his entire dignity. Intending to beg even the Lord turns dwarf in an instant".

Braj rendering:

*rahimana yacakatā gahe baḍe choṭa hvai jāta!
nārāyaṇa hū ko bhayo bāvana aṅgura gāta||*

"O Rahim, taking to begging even a big man turns small. Even Nārāyaṇa (Viṣṇu) came to have a body measuring fifty-two fingers".

Among other Muslims who could originally compose in Sanskrit mention may be made of Aurangzeb's half-brother the learned Dara Shikoh. The late P.K. Gode of Poona had discovered a Ms. dated 1708 A.D. of the Mughal Prince's Sanskrit composition, the *Samudrasaṅgama* wherein are pointed out the common features of Hinduism and Islam. Since with the same theme the prince had written the work *Majmul Bahrain* (=the confluence of the two oceans) in Persian, it is difficult to say as to whether the Sanskrit work is merely a translation by the prince or by some Pandit of his Persian work. More important than the above work, however, is a letter written in Sanskrit by the prince which was published in 1940 in the *Brahmavidyā*, the *Adyar Library Bulletin*. This shows the unusual command of the prince over Sanskrit which he handles almost in the style of Bāṇa:

svasti śrīmadvaidyānāthapadyārajaḥprapadyamānāgamyapūṇyasamāsādyasattamādyaprasādyasammādyanigādyakavikadambavṛndārakādhipābhivādyanirantarāsvādyasudhāsamvādyasamvitsamvedyānavadyahṛdyagadyapadyavidhānavaiśadyaśālisarvavidyāpradyotanoddyotasadyahkhadyotīkṛtānindyavandyavādīndravṛndeṣu ॥ 4 ॥

After Dara Shikoh, the great name among Muslim creative writers of Sanskrit is that of saint Akbar Shah who adorned the court of Nawab Tana Shah of the Qutb Shahi dynasty of Golconda. Akbar Shah is also known as Kalimullah Hussain or simply as Bade Sahib. He is famous because of his very valuable work in Sanskrit the *Śrīgāramañjarī*.¹ In this the devout Muslim starts with paying respects to Hindu divinities and his preceptor, the Guru:

*guruṁ gaṇapatiṁ durgāṁ vaṭukaṁ śivam acyutam
brahmāṇaṁ girijāṁ lakṣmīṁ vāṇīm vande vibhūtayell*

"I offer salutations to Guru, (preceptor), Gaṇapati (Gaṇeśa), Durgā, Vaṭuka, Śiva, Acyuta, Brahmā and Sarasvatī".

Akbar Shah or Bade Sahib was born, as he informs us in the Introduction to his work, in the family of Saint Gesu Daraz who lived between 1321-1422 A.D. and who came to the Deccan during the time of Feroz Ahmed 1st of Bahamani.

The *Śṛṅgāramañjarī* like the *Kāmasūtra* of Vātsyāyana, is a work on Erotics. The author deals with the subject in a scientific and authoritative manner. He says that one of the special features of his work is the description of the varieties of women called Padminī, etc. which the earlier works quoted by him had not dealt with. He deals with the varieties of the Nāyikās on the basis of the different kinds of moods and reactions in love and also classifies them by Guṇas. As regards the Nāyakas he mentions four types, Bhadra, Datta, Kumāra and Pāñcāla. The corresponding Nāyikā types are Hastinī Citriṇī, Śaṅkhinī and Padminī. The *Śṛṅgāramañjarī* elucidates some unknown facts in Nāyaka-Nāyikā relationship, gives more precise illustrations than those in the earlier treatises and wherever necessary abridges the treatment of the subject. The author's high conception of love with which he makes his definition of the Svīyā, Parakīyā and the Sāmānyā accord, is praiseworthy. Love, according to him, is only one indivisible object whether it is Svīyā or Parakīyā. It is to him an act of God: *daivayoga eva kāraṇam*.

Well-known scholars like Stein² have said that for a time Sanskrit was adopted as an official language by some of the Mohammedan rulers of Kashmir. Sanskrit inscriptions have been found on a number of Mohammedan tombs there. One of them on a tomb in the cemetery of Baha'uddin Sahib at Srinagar bears a date corresponding to A.D. 1484.

A stone inscription of Dhurail in the District of Dinajpur, West Bengal, of 1455, Saka Era records the construction of a bridge by one Faras Khan, Minister of Ministers in the reign of Muhammed Shah.³

While talking of the inscriptions mention needs to be made of the one on the silver coins of Sultan Mahmud, Hijri 418 (1018 A.D.). The coins have two sides. On one side in a circle they have the writing in Devanāgarī and on the other side in a circle in Arabic. The Devanagari has the words

(a) *avyaktam eka [m]*

(b) *muhammadah*

(c) [a] vatāra [h] nṛpa

(d) ti [h] mahamūdaḥ

Arabic side has the words

(a) *al-Qadir Billah*

(b) *la ilahi al-Allah Muhammad Rasul allah*

(c) *Amin al-dawala wa Amin almulk Mahmud*

As can be seen from the above the Devanagari version appearing on one side of the same coins is the Sanskrit rendering of that in Arabic. In this Allah is rendered by Avyakta and Rasul by Avatāra. La ilahi means one. La ilahi al-Allah means God is one. The same has been put in Sanskrit as *avyaktam ekam. Muhammad Rasul Allah* means Muhammad is the messenger of God. This has been conveyed by the words *Muhammadaḥ avatārah*.

The Gold Coins of Muizuddin Muhammad bin Sam (1193–1205 A.D.) also have Sanskrit writing on them:

1. [Śrī]ma[da]—

2. 2. [Mi]ra...mahā[ma] [da]...sa[ma]

[Śrīmaddhammīramuhammada] sāmā[putrah]

Hammīra, it may be pointed out in passing, is the Indian form of the Arabic word Amīr, commander, leader. The term in course of time came to be applied to kings, rulers and noblemen.

The National Museum, Kolkata has an inscription of the time of Aurangzeb (1657–1707), Śaka Year 1588, Bengali Year 1074 (1667 A.D.). Its language is Sanskrit and script is Bengali. It says that when Aurangzeb Badsha was the emperor, when Nawab Shaista Khan was the Governor of Gauḍamaṇḍala appointed by the emperor, when Ispinder Khan was the Jagirdar appointed by the Governor and Nandalāla was the Sikdar appointed by the Jagirdar, a Cāṇḍāla named Gopāla sold himself along with his wife, son and daughter to one Rāmajivana Maulika at Rs. Nine only to free himself from debt:

Aṣṭāśītyadhikapañcadaśaśakaśatābde sullutānapratāpāntar-gatadhama[rai]

grāmāntargatakāyasthapādānivāsi śrīgopināthamajumadāra-sadasyane

*strīputrakanyāsametam ātmānam ṛṇāny apahatya svecchayā
likhitavittadātri sthāpani
vikrītavān iti*

Of the inscriptions a rather interesting one is the one found from Somnath where one side has Sanskrit and the other Arabic. Though the contents in both the versions are the same, the presentation in Sanskrit is more detailed. It gives an account of one Nuruddin Feroze who is said to be a sea-merchant called *nākhudā* in Arabic and *nauvittaka* in Sanskrit. The inscription was put up in 1264 A.D.

Daraf Khan who is identified with Jaraf Khan and who conquered Saptagrāma in Bengal is said to have written a hymn to the Gaṅgā⁴ called *Gaṅgāstrotra* which in its diction is simply remarkable. An example from it would bear it out:

*suradhuni munikanye tārāye puṇyavantam
sa tarati nijapuṇyais tatra te kiṁ mahattvam/
yadi ca gativihīnam tārāye pāpinam mām
tad api tava mahattvam tan mahattvam mahattvam//*

“O the celestial river, the daughter of a sage, if thee delivereth a holy person, then what special is in that about thee? If thee were to deliver me, the sinner who has no other recourse, that is thy greatness; that greatness is greatness.

One of the most conspicuous monuments of the cultural intermingling of the Hindus and the Muslims is the appearance in the periodically increasing Upaniṣadic lore of the *Allopaniṣad* which reveals the means of the realization of Allah, God, as the Muslims would see it.

In Modern Period

The pursuit of Sanskrit by Muslims is not limited to the medieval or the early modern period only, it is being carried on even now. The number of Muslim Sanskrit scholars pursuing Sanskrit may not be very large but it is not too small either to be ignored. The very fact that there are some Muslims who have come forward to learn Sanskrit language and literature and acquire an amount of proficiency in it speaks well for the interaction and

cultural integration in India which all of us so ardently desire. Some of these Muslims have a deep and abiding love for Sanskrit so much so that one of them, Shri Ghulam Dastgir of Bombay, sent out an invitation for the marriage of his younger brother in Sanskrit which reads as follows:

अव्यक्तमेकं महम्मद अकारः

इति गजनी महमूदस्य नाणके

गमनागमने चापि भासो भवति यद्यपि

संमानो वर्धते मम अवश्यमुपस्थातव्यम्।

(रचयिता गुलाम दस्तगीर)

मम चतुर्थपुत्र महम्मद इसहाक इत्यस्य शुभविवाहः श्रीगुलाबसाहिब शेखमहोदयस्य (भूतपूर्व इन्दापुरनगराध्यक्षस्य) कनिष्ठ-सुकन्यया रशीदा इत्यनया सह सुनिश्चितः कृतः।

अयं विवाहसमारोहः अस्य डिसेम्बरमासस्य एकविंशतितमे दिनाङ्के रविवसरे (21.12.1975) प्रातः सार्धदशवादनसमये (10.30) पोमलवाडी रेलयानस्थानक-समीपे विनिर्मिते मण्डपे समाराजितः भविष्यति इति समुदं निवेदये। अस्मिन् शुभावसरे भवद्भिः सपरिवारमागत्य शुभाशिषः समर्थयितव्या इति मनसा साग्रहं प्रार्थये।

भवदीया विनीता

मासूम बी अब्बास अली विराजदार

Shri Dastgir is one of the Sanskrit scholars honoured in 1976 by the Govt. of Maharashtra and is its Coordinator for Sanskrit at present.

In the early part of the present century a Muslim scholar of Aligarh Shri Habibur Rehman Shastri had devoted years to the study of Sanskrit and come to be known as Pandit Habibur Rehman Shastri. He published a commentary called the *Tattvaparakāśa* on the *Īsopaniṣad* besides a critique on Rasa called the *Rasadarśana*. He was a frequent contributor to the *Tattvacintāmaṇi*, a magazine published from Vrindavan.

Prof. Fatehullah Mojtabai, Former Cultural Counsellor of the Embassy of Iran in India is a noted Sanskrit scholar and a well-known exponent of Hindu philosophy. He has translated into Persian the *Gītā*, the *Laghuyogavāsiṣṭha* and the *Mahopaniṣad* with Notes and Text-study. During his stay in India he had

delivered in New Delhi three Zakir Hussain Memorial Lectures on 'Hindu-Muslim relationship'.

Being one of the premier centres of learning for Muslims of India, the Aligarh Muslim University has led, among other subjects, to the spread of Sanskrit education among Muslims a number of whom have pursued it upto Post-Graduation and research.

The honour of being the first alumnus of that University who did Post-Graduation from there and was the first one to teach Sanskrit there goes to Habibur Rehman Shastri referred to above. His main interest was the comparative study of the Hindu-Muslim philosophy. To follow him was Dr. Nazir Mohammad, who having done Ph.D. in Hindi after Post-Graduation in Sanskrit from that University, got appointment there in the Department of Hindi where he rose to the position of Professor and Head. Dr. Ayub Khan, another product of that University, is now Professor and Head, Department of Sanskrit, University of Kashmir, Srinagar, the first Muslim in all probability to occupy the post. The most illustrious product of that University so far has been Dr. Mohammad Israil Khan, Ex-Professor of Sanskrit, University of Delhi, who after obtaining the Ph.D. degree from that University had worked for some time in its Sanskrit Department before moving on to other places and who is the only one among the Muslim scholars of Sanskrit of India who got the State recognition in the form of the President of India Certificate of Honour in 2001 apart from winning many awards and honours from a number of institutions like the Sampurnanand Sanskrit University, the Vikramshila Vidyapeeth and the Uttar Pradesh Sanskrit Sansthan. He has published ten books and 105 research articles. Two of his books *Sarasvatī in Sanskrit Literature* and *Brahmā in the Purāṇas* have gone into second edition. A dedicated scholar, he continues with his studies and researches. His forthcoming titles are the *Naiṣadha* with explanation and notes, *Sources of Sanskrit Drama*, *Some Common Features of the R̥gvedic Society and Culture*, *Glimpses of the Vedic Lore*, *A Peep in the Atharvavedic Herbs* and the *Etymologies in the Nirukta* besides three or four works

of general interest. He has carried out a good survey of the present-day Muslim Sanskritists in his monograph in Hindi *Musalmānoṅ kā Sanskrit ko Yogadāna*. Shortly he will be coming out with a collection of Sanskrit poems of his composition under the title *Samskṛtalatikāyāḥ Katipayāni Prasūnāni*. Apart from his work, critical and creative, he has furthered Sanskrit studies by guiding a large number of young scholars for the M.Phil. and Ph.D. degrees and attended many conferences and seminars, national and international.

Another notable Muslim scholar who received her education at the Aligarh Muslim University is Dr. Salma Mahfooz. She came to occupy the position of Professor and Head, Department of Sanskrit there from where she retired recently. She has the rare distinction of being the first Muslim woman to have done Ph.D. in Sanskrit. The topic of her research was "Sanskrit Nāṭakoṅ meṅ Nāyikābheda", The Classification of Nāyikās (Heroines) in Sanskrit Dramas. She had got enrolled at the Department of Sanskrit, Aligarh Muslim University in 1967 and had completed her work in the record period of two years, qualifying herself for the Ph.D. degree in 1969. In 1977 she brought out her work in book form. Under the research scheme of the University Grants Commission she worked on the *Samudrasaṅgama* of Dara Shikoh. Her three-year stay in Iraq from 1979-81 brought her in contact with Arabic as also the commonality between Hinduism and Islam propelling her to work on *Sirr-e-Akbar*, the translation of the Upaniṣads by Dara Shikoh. She translated the Persian gloss of the Prince (Dara Shikoh) on the first chapter of the *Bṛhadāranyakopaniṣad* into Sanskrit and published it with the original text of the said Upaniṣad. She also translated into Hindi the entire *Sirr-e-Akbar* with the original Upaniṣadic text. She is a frequent contributor to oriental research journals which have carried scores of her research studies.

Among others who studied at the same University, mention could be made of Dr. Mohammad Ali who did his Ph.D. on the "Etymologies in the *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa*" and is working at present in the Kishori Raman College, Mathura; a couple, Dr.

Rukhsana Parween who worked for her Doctorate on "References to Akbar the Great in Sanskrit Literature from 16th-18th Centuries" and teaches Sanskrit at the Govt. College, Bijnor and her husband Mr. Raunaq Ali who teaches Sanskrit at the Govt. College, Nuh (Haryana); Dr. Nizamuddin who did Ph.D. on "Prācīna Bhāratīya Sāhitya meṁ Varṇita Bhāratīya Khel"; Dr. Shakir Ali, who produced a thesis on "Bhoja ke Nāma se Pracalita *Yuktikalpataru* kā ek Ālocanātmaka Adhyayana"; Dr. Rizwana Begum Shamsi who did Ph.D. on "Pali Tripiṭaka meṁ Sṛṣṭiprakriyā"; Dr. Shaheen Ahmad whose thesis was on "Akbarshah-kṛta *Śṛṅgāramañjarī* kā Ālocanātmaka Adhyayana"; Dr. Khalid-bin Yusuf who did Ph.D. on "Ṛgvedīya Ācāraśāstra"; Dr. Rizwana Parveen whose thesis was on "Paramānanda ka *Śivabhārata* : Samīkṣātmaka Adhyayana"; Dr. Shamim Ahmad who worked on "A Critical Study of the *Cidgaganacandrikā* attributed to Kālidāsa"; Dr. Nazni Parveen who did Ph.D. on "Hariścandra kā *Jivandharacampū* : Ek Ālocanātmaka Adhyayana"; Dr. Nagma Sultan whose research topic was "Kavisamaya evaṁ Bṛhattrayī meṁ uskā Anupālana"; Dr. Ayesha Anwar who worked on "Bhojarājapraṇīta *Śṛṅgāramañjarīkathā* : Ek Samīkṣātmaka Adhyayana"; Dr. Wahid Nasroo who did Ph.D. on "Rājaśekharasūrikṛta *Prabandhakośa* : Ek Samīkṣātmaka Adhyayana" and Dr. Marufur Rehman whose Ph.D. topic was "*Brahmavaivartapurāṇa* kā Dārśanika Adhyayana". Apart from the above who did Ph.D., more than ten Muslims have done M.Phil. from that University.

Two of the old alumni of that University have association with the Rashtriya Sanskrit Sansthan, New Delhi. One of them, Dr. M.K. Durrani Shastri retired from there some years back while the other Dr. Mohammad Hanif Shastri is still in service.

Dr. M.K. Durrani Shastri, worked for his Ph.D. dissertation on "A Comparative Study of the Duties of Man as prescribed in the Gītā and the Koran" and wrote a commentary in Urdu on the *Uttarārāmacarita* apart from publishing a few verses in the Mālinī metre on Viśvabandhutva, universal brotherhood, in the *Sanskrit Ratnākara* in addition to publishing articles in Sanskrit journals

like the *Gāṇḍīva*, the *Surabhārati* and so on. Dr. Mohammad Hanif Khan Shastri wrote his thesis for the Vidyāvāridhi (Ph.D.) degree of the Kameshwar Singh Darbhanga Sanskrit University on the topic “Artha, Prayoga aur Māhātmya kī Dr̥ṣṭi se Mahāmantra Gāyatrī aur Sūrah Fātihā kā Tulanātmaka Adhyayana” which he later published under the title *Veda aur Qurān se Mahāmantra Gāyatrī aur Sūrah Fātihā*. His other publications include the *Mohanagītā*, the translation of the *Śrīmadbhagavadgītā* in easy Hindi verse (the title Mohana he picked up to indicate the first letter of the two parts of his name (Mo for Mohammad, Ha for Hanif and the last letter, of the last part of it, Khan, na), *Gītā aur Qurān meī Sāmañjasya*, *Vedon meī Mānava Adhikāra*, *Vaidika Sāhitya meī Mānava Kartavya*, *Mahāmantra Gāyatrī kā Bauddhika Upayoga*, *Mantraśāstra aur Upayoga* and *Yantramahimā*. Besides the above books he has published well over fifty articles in different magazines and journals. At present he is working on *Sanātana Dharma aur Islam : Samāna Dr̥ṣṭi* (Commonalities between Sanātana Dharma and Islam).

In the context of the Aligarh Muslim University reference had been made to the work on Dara Shikoh by Dr. Salma Mahfooz. Another scholar to work on Dara Shikoh is Dr. Ghulam Mustafa who produced a thesis through the medium of Sanskrit on the learned Mughal Prince under the title “Dārā Shikohasya Vyaktitvam Kṛtitvam ca” for the Vidyāvāridhi (Ph.D.) degree from the Sampurnanand Sanskrit University, Varanasi. A good speaker of Sanskrit, he likes to write letters in Sanskrit a good number of which he has addressed to his supervisor Prof. Bhagirath Prasad Tripathi “Vagish Shastri”, former Director of Research, Sampurnanand Sanskrit University which the latter proposes to bring out in course of time in the form of a monograph. From another University of Varanasi, the Banaras Hindu University, a gentleman the late Shaukat Sultan did M.A. in Sanskrit and taught Sanskrit at the Shibly National School at Azamgarh. From still another University of Varanasi, the Mahatma Gandhi Kashi Vidyapeeth, a Muslim lady, Dr. Naheed

Abidi, did Ph.D. in Sanskrit on the twin deities *Āśvins*. A part time teacher in Sanskrit at the above Vidyapith and some other institutions for the past twenty years or so, she has taken up propagation of Sanskrit as a mission. Apart from her thesis on a Vedic topic which introduced her to Vedic lore, she has translated into Sanskrit under the title *Devālayasya dīpaḥ* the poem *Chiraghe-dair* of the well-known Urdu poet Mirza Ghalib as also the poems of Rahim. Dr. Mohammad Sharif who is now teaching Sanskrit at the Aligarh Muslim University is a product of the Allahabad University wherefrom he did his Ph.D. on "Naladamayantikathā kā Ālocanātmaka Adhyayana" and D.Litt. on "Sanskrit Kathā Sāhitya kā Ālocanātmaka Anuśilana". His wife Dr. Shaheen Jafri, also a Sanskrit scholar, had worked on "Hariharānanda-Āraṇya-kṛta *Bhāṣyavati* kā Ālocanātmaka Adhyayana" and is presently teaching Sanskrit as Reader and Head at the National Shibly College, Azamgarh. Mr. Ausaf Ali, a specialist in Veda, is presently teaching Sanskrit at the Gorakhpur University. Dr. B.C. Hussaini of the Sri Venkateswara University, Tirupati had worked for his Ph.D. on "A Study of the *Mādhavīya Dhātuvṛtti*." Three Muslim ladies of Saharanpur have done Ph. D. in Sanskrit from C.S.S. University, Meerut. One, Dr. Hamira Anjum, worked on "Mahābhārata meṁ Śāpa—Ek Vivecana", the second, Dr. Atiya Danish, on "Smṛti Sāhitya meṁ Gṛhasthāśrama" and the third, Dr. Shiba Parveen, on "Vartamāna Kāla meṁ *Manusmṛti* kī Prāsaṅgikatā." Dr. Atiya Danish's work was published in 2004 while that of Dr. Shiba Parveen is under publication. Dr. Atiya Danish is continuing with her researches. Under the U.G.C. Unemployed Women's Research Scheme she has undertaken a project on a "Study of the Brahmacaryāśrama in Smṛti Literature with reference to Modern Period." There are about a dozen Muslim Sanskrit scholars who are teaching Sanskrit in different educational institutions full details about whom are being collected and will be put on record as soon as they are ascertained. Similarly are these being collected about unattached Muslim Sanskritists whose number could be fairly large. About Muslim women, some discontinued studies after M.A. or M.Phil.

in Sanskrit and returned to family life. It is a task daunting enough to trace information about them.

Not all Muslim Sanskritists are in the teaching line or are connected with educational institutions or had any formal education. In the first category comes Dr. Nizamuddin, a Ph.D. in Sanskrit, as mentioned earlier, from the Aligarh Muslim University (he had worked on games in ancient Sanskrit literature), who is working at present as District Supply Officer at Badaun. In the second comes Mr. Bashir Ahmad Mayukh who, a simple farmer of Salpura of Kota District of Rajasthan has translated some of the Vedic hymns into simple Hindi and is recipient of the K.K. Birla Foundation's prestigious Bihari Award.

Of the Indian States it is in Kerala that there is a regular tradition of Christians and Muslims learning Sanskrit, unlike in other States where it is a casual phenomenon. It is not uncommon to come across there a good sprinkling of Christian and Muslim students studying Sanskrit along with their Hindu class fellows even in traditional institutions, the Gurukulas, Vidyālayas and what are called Sanskrit Colleges. It is a happy experience to see them specializing in such difficult branches of learning as Nyāya, Logic, Vedānta, Monistic Philosophy and Sāhitya, Poetics that require a high degree of application and dedicated effort in learning the rather abstruse texts replete with technical jargon. A couple of students of these institutions have completed their studies and are now teaching Sanskrit in one institution or the other. There is one Kadija Bibi who did her M.A. with Sāhitya Special from the Sanskrit College, Pattambi and is now teaching in the same institution after serving for a time in the Kendriya Sanskrit Vidyapitha, Pavaratti. A gentleman of the name of Puru Kannu is now a lecturer in the Govt. Sanskrit College, Thriruananthapuram after having passed from the same institution M.A. with Nyāya Special. He also worked for Ph.D. on the *Praśastapādabhāṣya*. Abdul Rahman, another gentleman like him is a lecturer in Sanskrit in Cochin College after having passed M.A. in Sanskrit with Sāhitya Special with a First Class First. In Kaladi, the birth place of Shankaracharya, a lady, Pathuma Bibi,

who is just a house wife now, not serving anywhere, did her M.A. with Vedānta Special from the Govt. Sanskrit College, Thiruvananthapuram with a First Class First. She did M. Phil. Another scholar matching Pathuma Bibi in brilliance is Zubaida Bibi who did her M.A. with Sāhitya Special from the Govt. Sanskrit College, Thiruvananthapuram. She is now a lecturer in the Govt. Sanskrit College, Pattambi. The present Professor who till recently was also the Head of Department of Sanskrit at the Kerala University, Thiruvananthapuram is Prof. Bashir Ahmad, a Muslim.

The writer of these lines had the opportunity of working in two Universities of Bangkok, the Chulalongkorn University and the Silpakorn University from 1977-79 and 1989-91. In both of these he had a colleague each from the Muslim community, Dr. Mrs. Pranee Lapanich and Dr. Mrs. Kusuma Raksamani. Dr. Pranee is an M.A., Ph.D. from the University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia and Dr. Kusuma, an M.A., Ph.D. from the University of Toronto, Toronto. For her M.A. dissertation Dr. Pranee worked on the 'Vipralambha Śṛṅgāra in Sanskrit Literature.' For her Ph.D. she worked on 'Kṣemendra and his *Kalāvīlāsa*.' Dr. Kusuma Raksamani worked for her M.A. dissertation on a study of the Sanskrit, Lao and Thai Texts on Pravāhlikā, a kind of Sanskrit short story. For her Ph.D. she worked on the Southern Recension of the *Tantropākhyāna* comparing in the course of her study the first part of the said work with that of the Lao and the Thai recensions. Dr. Kusuma is younger in age to Dr. Pranee, the latter having taught the former the Pali language. Interestingly enough, both of them have their private names, a practice common among Thai Muslims, which differs from their public names. Dr. Pranee's private name is Jamila and Dr. Kusuma's Maria. Dr. Pranee's main source for inspiration for learning Sanskrit was Dr. Chaluay, the former Head of the Department of Sanskrit in the Chulalongkorn University. While in the Fourth Semester, Dr. Pranee had read through the Thai medium such Sanskrit texts as the *Vetālapañcaviṃśati*, the *Hitopadeśa*, the *Dvātriṃśatputtalikāśimhāsana*, the *Priyadarśikā*, the

Abhijñānaśākuntala and so on. When she wanted to proceed further in her Sanskrit studies, Dr. Chaluay, her Buddhist teacher, said to her as if to test the extent of her interest in the subject: "Pranee, you are a Muslim. You come from a different cultural background. You will not be able to carry on with a literature of a different culture." Dr. Pranee's answer to this was: "Madam, I am not only a Muslim, but a staunch Muslim. But my religion cannot come in the way of my Sanskrit studies. I shall pursue them." Dr. Chaluay would be all smiles at this and would begin to teach her with renewed vigour. Dr. Pranee can recite the Ayats of the Qoran with as much ease and felicity as the Mantras of the Vedas. When a friend had said to Dr. Kusuma the same thing as Dr. Chaluay had said to Dr. Pranee; her, Dr. Kusuma's, reaction was exactly the same as that of Pranee. Both of them are strongly of the opinion that religion has nothing to do with learning a language. The result is that both of them are scholars of Sanskrit in their own right.

Dr. Pranee has recently published her Thai translation of the *Manusmṛti*.

Before closing, a word is due here about the students studying Sanskrit at the School, College and the University level. Some of them have done exceedingly well in the subject. A notable example of this is Ayesha Sardar, daughter of Prof. Abdul Karim, Professor of Persian, Ahmadnagar College, who topped the list in 1973-74 in the subject of Sanskrit in S.S.C. Examination in the whole of the State of Maharashtra.

More recently, in October 2006, Shajeena S., a Muslim girl from Kerala, topped in the Kerala University M.A. Sanskrit examination. She is the first Muslim topper in the University's history. The 25 year old is the second of the three daughters of Shahul Hamid, a labourer. She opted for Sanskrit four years ago with her parents' blessings. When asked by some people as to why she did not choose Arabic in place of Sanskrit, Shajeena said that "Sanskrit is the most apt language for Indians since most Indian languages are its offshoots." When Shajeena recites *ślokas* at home, her family finds them melodious. She herself says that

there is poetry in every syllable of them. She wants to launch a Sanskrit magazine to help Sanskrit lovers in India express their creativity. She wants some day to teach her children Sanskrit and mourns : "It is a shame this beautiful language is reduced to a Cindrella in her own land."

From what has been said above, it should be clear that the Muslims, both past and present, have done a lot for the cause of Sanskrit which they have owned, loved and fostered. They have proved, if proof was ever needed, that languages and literatures cannot be identified with any particular section of society. Sanskrit is as much of the Hindus as that of the Muslims. Like the varied channels enriching the waters of the sacred Gaṅgā it has continued to be enriched by different communities over the centuries. Hindus, Muslims, Christians, all have contributed to its growth and development. They, all of them, are a shining example of the close cultural synthesis of the different religions and races which makes for better cohesion in human relationship leading to a more peaceful, a more happy and a more purposeful life.

REFERENCES

1. Edited with a Critical Study by Dr. V. Raghavan, Hyderabad Archaeological Department, Hyderabad, 1951.
2. *Kalhana's Chronicle of the Kings of Kashmir*, Vol. I, p. 130, f. n. 2; *Z.D.M.G.*, XL, 9; *Ind. Ant.*, XX, 153.
3. Sanyal, N., List of Inscriptions in the Museums of the Varendra Research Society, Rajshahi, p. 14.
4. *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*, Calcutta, Vol. XVI, 1847, pp. 393 ff.

X

Some Peripheral Literature: Lexicography and Medicine

It is not only in poetry, drama, fiction and philosophy that Sanskrit literature exhibits its richness, it does so in technical sciences as well. There have been thinkers in India who have contributed substantially to different technical disciplines a brief assessment of two of which is given here.

Lexicography

The oldest works in this discipline are the *Nighaṇṭus*, collections of Vedic terms which have been explained by Yāska in his etymological treatise, the *Nirukta*. These collections differ in many respects from the dictionaries, the *Kośas*, of the later period. The first pertains to the purpose for which the two types of collections were made. In the case of the *Nighaṇṭus*, it was the interpretation of the sacred texts. In the case of the *Kośas*, it was to supply words to poets and writers and to acquaint them with their precise meanings and gender. The second pertains to their being restricted to any particular subject or otherwise. In the case of the *Nighaṇṭus*, they are limited to a particular text, in the case of the *Kośas*, they do not have any such restriction, drawing words as they do from all types of works. The third pertains to their form. While the *Nighaṇṭus* are in prose, the *Kośas* are in verse, mostly in the *anuṣṭubh* and sometimes also in the *āryā* metre.

The purpose of the *Kośas* being written in verse probably was to help in their being committed to memory. The traditional

system of Sanskrit education emphasizes at a very early stage itself the storing in memory by the learner of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* of Pāṇini and the *Amarakośa* of Amarasimha, thus equipping him with vocabulary and grammatical knowledge that are to stand him in good stead in his going over to any discipline. Were he to choose writing for self-expression, the value of both need no emphatic assertion. It was the prime motive of placing sufficient vocabulary at the disposal of a prospective writer that possibly accounts for the attribution of dictionaries to such celebrated writers as Bāṇa, Mayūra, Murāri and Śrīharṣa, the last of whom is credited with having compiled the lists of words with double meanings: *Śleṣārthapadasaṁgraha*.

The Sanskrit *Kośas*, as available at present, can broadly be divided into two types. There are some which are synonymous, listing words with the same meaning and others which are homonymous, listing words with different meanings (*anekārtha*, *nānārtha*) though important synonymous dictionaries have a homonymous section also in them. In neither of the two is followed the alphabetical order, that not being felt essential for the fact of the *Kośas* having to be committed to memory any way. That does not mean that the arrangement of the words in them is arbitrary. It follows other principles. The longer articles come first and the shorter ones later. The common final endings or beginnings may decide their grouping. So may the common gender. The words generally appear in the nominative, singly or in a compound as per the exigencies of the metre, as also the meanings, except in homonymous dictionaries where they appear in the locative. Where the gender is specially mentioned, it is in the locative again, where it is not mentioned, it is indicated by the use of the word in that gender. Some dictionaries have a section on gender at the end. Occasionally the compilers of dictionaries give rather long explanations of words. Normally the meaning is indicated by clubbing an unfamiliar word with a familiar one.

Just as in *Vyākaraṇa* Pāṇini has stolen the limelight, so has among lexicographers *Amarasimha*, the compiler of the celebrated

Nāmalingānuśāsana which is known much more as the *Amarakośa* after his name. There did precede him lexicographers like Kātyāyana, who is credited with the compilation of the *Nāmamālā*, Vācaspati and Vikramāditya, the compilers of the *Śabdārṇava* and the *Saṁsārāvarta*, and Vyāḍi whose *Utpalinī* incorporating Buddhist terms is often cited. Traditionally being associated with King Vikramāditya as one of his nine jewels, Amarasimha can be assigned to the sixth century A.D., though there is no other ground to support this. His work, which is synonymous, is divided into three books or *kāṇḍas* with an appendix on homonyms, indeclinables and genders and is commented upon widely, the more important of his commentators being Kṣīrasvāmin, Sarvānanda, Rāyamukuta and Bhānujīdikṣita. A supplement to it was provided by Puruṣottamadeva under the title *Trikāṇḍaśeṣa*. He also compiled the short independent work, the *Hārāvali*. Perhaps as old as Amara is Śāśvata whose homonymous work, the *Anekārthasamuccaya* devotes sometimes a whole verse or a part thereof to the explanation of a term.

Among other dictionaries could be mentioned the *Abhidhānamālā* of Halāyudha, 950 A.D. and the *Vaijayantī* of Yādavaprakāśa, 1050 A.D., the latter rather voluminous. There is a good crop of lexical works in the twelfth century AD. the more prominent of these are the *Abhidhānacintāmaṇi*, a dictionary of homonymous words in six sections again beginning with one-syllable words and ending with six-syllable ones and the *Nighaṇṭuśeṣa* by the prolific Jain writer Hemacandra. Another Jain compiler Dhanañjaya compiled between A.D. 1113-1140 his *Nāmamālā*. In A.D. 1111 Maheśvara compiled his *Viśvaprakāśa* followed a little later by Maṅkha who compiled the *Anekārthakośa* to which he also added a commentary of his own. To A.D. 1200 belongs Keśavasvāmin's *Nānārthārṇavasaukṣepa*. In the fourteenth century Medinikara wrote his *Anekārthaśabdakośa* which like the *Amarakośa* came to be known after his name as the *Medinīkośa*.

There are certain minor works also in the field of Sanskrit lexicography an account of which may not be out of place here.

They are *Ekākṣarakośa*, words of one syllable, the *Dvirūpa* or *Trirūpakośa*, words of two or three forms and the dictionaries of certain specific disciplines like, medicine, astronomy and astrology. The Vedic tradition of *Nighaṇṭus* was revived by the Buddhists who produced works such as the *Mahāvvyutpatti* for interpreting the Buddhist terms in prose.

In the field of Sanskrit lexicography a rather interesting work is the *Pārasīprakāśa*, a Persian-Sanskrit Dictionary compiled in the time of Akbar. In 1693 Vedāṅgarāya used the same title for his dictionary of astronomical and astrological terms.

In 972 Dhanapāla compiled for his sister *Sundarī Paiyalacchī*, a Prākṛta dictionary which was used by Hemacandra for his *Deśināmamālā*, a compilation of Deśī words, words which are neither of Sanskrit, *tatsama*, nor derived from it, *tadbhava*.

This brief survey will enable the reader to form a general idea of the large corpus of Sanskrit lexicographical literature which has listed an enormous number of words in their immense variety of meanings. As the Sanskrit language grew with the incorporation of new words, whether of Indian or foreign origin there appeared deep imprints of foreign influence in disciplines like astronomy, astrology, medicine and natural and physical sciences and as meanings underwent change due to natural processes, the need was felt to compile newer and newer dictionaries to incorporate all the new material in addition to retaining the old one. Hence the appearance of a big crop of dictionaries and lexica over the centuries. These dictionaries and the lexica are a standing testimony to the richness of the Sanskrit language and its minute expressiveness.

Medicine

The origin of the science of medicine or *Āyurveda* can be traced in India, like the origin of the many other kinds of sciences, to the Vedas, particularly, the *Atharvaveda* which has hymns in it for curing diseases, *bhaiṣajyāni*, and for increasing the life-span, *āyusyāni*. There is mention of the twin divine physicians Aśvinau with wonderful healing powers. In one of the hymns they are said

to have supplied a leg to one Viṣpalā: *viṣpalāyai jaṅghām adattam*, the earliest reference in Sanskrit literature to the transplantation of limbs.

The simple folk in India in early periods, as the people elsewhere, had nurtured a belief that diseases are the handiwork of demons or evil spirits and that their cure is possible by warding them off by recitation of *mantras* or performance of magic rites. This belief continued long after the period of the Vedas for we have even in the well-developed treatises on Āyurveda a section on treatment of diseases caused by demons.

Tradition recognizes Āyurveda, also called Vaidyaśāstra, the science of the doctor, as an *upāṅga*, a sub-auxiliary of the *Atharvaveda* which preserves the ancient knowledge of embryology and hygiene.

There is a legend in India of the Ocean of Milk having been churned by gods and demons. For medical science the importance of the legend lies in the appearance from the said Ocean, along with others, of Dhanvantari, the mythical physician, typifying the yearning of the ancient Indians for a physician with extraordinary healing powers. Tradition also associates Dhanvantari with Vikramāditya as one of his nine jewels. Whether the two are identical is open to question.

The Āyurveda is called *aṣṭāṅga*, or eight limbs of topics, which are major surgery, minor surgery, healing of diseases, children's diseases, toxicology, elixirs and aphrodisiacs. Patañjali in his *Mahābhāṣya*, in the context of the scope of the use of word, mentions it along with Purāṇa, Itihāsa and Vākovākya thus attesting to its antiquity. It appears that treatises on specific topics called Tantras or Kalpas were composed first. Later comprehensive treatises called Samhitās, which dealt with all the eight topics referred to above, made their appearance.

The sage Ātreya is usually mentioned as the founder of the Āyurveda. The Buddhist tradition records the name of one Jivaka, a pupil of Ātreya who specialized in children's diseases. The Vinaya piṭaka and other Buddhist texts show a wide knowledge

of elementary medical science, surgical instruments and hot baths, etc.

The earliest of the treatises on medical science in India is the *Carakasamhitā*, the compendium of Caraka, a court physician of Kaniṣka whose wife he helped in a critical case. The work, as it is available now, is not the work of Caraka alone, for it was revised by one Dṛḍhabala who added the last two chapters to it besides contributing seventeen out of twenty-eight or thirty chapters of its Book VI. A native of Kashmir, Dṛḍhabala, ascribed to the eighth century A.D. was the son of Kapilabala and apart from carrying out the revision of the *Carakasamhitā* as mentioned above, is credited with the revision of a number of *Tantras* of Agniveśa, a pupil of Punarvasu Ātreya, a fellow student of Bheḍa or Bhela whose *Samhitā* on that score is taken by some to be older than that of Caraka. The *Carakasamhitā* is divided into various sections, called Sthānas each dealing with certain specific topics: the *Sūtrasthāna* with remedies, diet and the duties of a doctor; *Nidānasthāna* with eight chief diseases; *Vimānasthāna* with general pathology and medical studies; *Śarīrasthāna* with anatomy and embryology; *Indriyasthāna* with diagnosis and prognosis; *Cikitsāsthāna* with special therapy and the *Kalpa* and the *Siddhisthānas* with general therapy.

The next great name in the field of Indian medical science is that of Suśruta, described in the *Mahābhārata* as the son of Viśvāmitra. The famous Nāgārjuna is said to have worked on his text. His fame had spread even beyond the confines of India, to Cambodia in the East and Arabia in the West in the ninth and the tenth centuries A.D. as evidenced by the literary tradition of those countries. He was commented upon by Jaiyaṭa, Gayadāsa and Cakrapāṇidatta who had also commented upon the *Carakasamhitā* and whose commentary on Suśruta was supplemented by Ḍallaṇa in the thirteenth century A.D. One Candraṭa had revised his text on the basis of the commentary of Jaiyaṭa. His work has six sections which, except the last one, the *Uttaratantra*, clearly a later addition, carry the same titles as does the work of Caraka. Its *Sūtrasthāna* deals with general questions,

imparting also the information that the author (Suśruta) was the pupil of King Divodāsa of Vārāṇasī. The *Nidānasthāna* concerns itself with pathology, *Śarīrasthāna* with anatomy and embryology, the *Cikitsāsthāna* with therapeutics and the *Kalpasthāna* with toxicology.

The next important work is the *Bhelasamhitā* which carries the same divisions as does the *Carakasamhitā*. As regards osteology, a third version of the system of Ātreya in addition to those of Caraka and Bhela is found in the *Yājñavalkya* and *Viṣṇu Smṛtis* and the *Viṣṇudharmottara* and the *Agni Purāṇas*.

Vāgbhaṭa, another great name in Indian medical tradition, is recognised to be posterior to Suśruta. Interestingly, there are two writers of this name, both claiming the same parentage in their works, the *Aṣṭāṅgasaṅgraha* and the *Aṣṭāṅgahrdayasamhitā*. From the fact that one of the two is called Vṛddha Vāgbhaṭa, the Elder Vāgbhaṭa, it would appear that both were different people and it is possible that they might have shared the same descent. The Elder Vāgbhaṭa or Vṛddha Vāgbhaṭa was the son of Sindhagupta and the pupil of the Buddhist Avalikhita. The younger Vāgbhaṭa appears to have made use of the work of his elder namesake in a mixture of verse and prose while that of the former is in verse.

Other works on medical science include the *Rugviniścaya* of Mādhavakara, an important text on pathology, the *Siddhiyoga* or *Vṛndamādhava* of Vṛnda, a text giving prescriptions for a number of ailments from fever to poisoning, the *Cikitsāsārasaṅgraha* of Cakrapāṇidatta, a text on therapeutics, and the *Cikitsāmṛta* of Malhaṇa, a work on general medicine.

The *Samhitā* of Śārṅgadharma is commented upon by Vopadeva, son of the physician Keśava and a protege of Hemādri (1300 century A.D.) who also wrote a *Śataślokī*, a work on powders, pills and the use of the pulse in diagnosis.

Numerous other works on medicine came to be written in later centuries, the more noteworthy of them being the *Cikitsākalikā* of Tisata (fourteenth century), the *Bhāvprakāśa* of Bhāvamīśra (sixteenth century) and the *Vaidyaśrāvāna* of

Lolimbarāja (seventeenth century). There also appeared large numbers of monographs on different diseases including the one on the diseases of plants, the *Vṛkṣāyurveda* of Surapāla.

Apart from herbs, the *kāṣṭhaśadhas*, prescribed as medicines, the texts on Āyurveda record a number of other preparations with effective curative properties. They are the *bhasmas* of various metals especially of gold and silver. The treatment extended itself even to the use of quick-silver (*pārada*) in its various formulations, and sulphur and other acids for treating malignant diseases. The effectiveness of the medication is ensured with its accompaniment, the *anupāna*, milk, butter milk, curd, the decoction (*kvātha*) and so on. The treatment also rests on certain types of diets to be partaken for certain periods, the *kalpas*, to subsist on milk alone or curd alone for twenty-one days or forty days and so on.

The ancient Indians had achieved a high degree of accuracy in diagnosing the ailment by feeling the pulse, a tradition that has come down to the present-day. They had evolved a theory of the three humours, the *Vāta* (wind), *Pitta* (bile) and *Kapha* (phlegm) the disturbance of which is the cause of the disease. Efforts have, therefore, to be made to keep them on an even keel which can be done by proper health care. Āyurveda is the science of good health and not only the curing of diseases.

□ □ □

Index

A

- Abbasids 250
 Abdul Aziz Shams Lahauri 251
 Abdul Quadir 259
 Abdul Rahim Khan-i-Khana 260
Abdullācarita 257
 Abdullah 257
 Abhidhā 7
Abhidhānacintāmaṇi 281
Abhidhānamālā 281
 Abhidhāvādin 7
Abhijñānaśākuntala 17, 18, 19,
 70, 72, 73, 74, 81, 85, 91,
 100, 117, 119, 122, 125, 129,
 132, 237, 249
 Abhinanda 27
 Abhinavagupta 228
 Abhramati 191
abhujīyā 152
 Abi Usaybiyah 250
 Abu 231
 Abu Raihan B. Ahmad al-Biruni
 251
 Abul Fazl 259
Acalaparvata 231
 Acyuta Piśāroṭa 205
adharā 180
 Adhiṣṭhāna 30, 31
adhikakāntikāntaḥ 68
 Adhikaraṇika 140
adhvara 78, 79
 Ādi Śaṅkarācārya 37
 Ādikāvya 14
 Aditi 92, 97
 Ādityas 49
Adriputrīmaheśaputrāya 68, 70
adritanayā 70
 Advaitavādaḥ 40
 Afghanistan 33
agāra 73
 Agasti 43, 44, 45
 Agastya 86, 109, 202, 203
āgneya kīṭa 138
 Agni 97, 110, 111, 169
Agni-purāṇa 275
agniśaraṇa 73
agnicit 75
 Agnihotrin 72, 73
 Agnimitra 120, 121
Agnivarma 78
Agniveśa 284

- Agniveśya 43, 44, 45
 agnyagāra 73
 Agrā 189
 ahakapramukhyān 68
 Āhavanīya 72, 73, 82
 āhitāgni 75
 Ahmed 265
 aho aho 68
 āhutiśādhana 75
 Aja 17, 75, 90, 93, 101, 112, 127
 Ajātaśatru 161
 Ajitanātha Nyāyaratna 216
 Akabariya Kālidāsa 253
 Ākāśa 243
 Akbar 253, 254, 257, 258, 259,
 260, 272
 Akbar Shah 265
 Ākhyānas 32
 Akrūra 210
 al-Biruni 250, 251, 259
 Al-Haritha 250
 Alakā 115, 116, 178, 185, 209,
 229
 Alakāpuri 185, 228
 Alankāraśāstras 8
 Alauddin Khilji 251
 Allah 266
 Allahabad 206
 Allakappa 162
 Allopāṇiśad 268
 Almagest 251
 Alwars 253
 Alwaye 204, 212, 230
 Amara/Amarakośa 280, 281
 Amarasiṃha 280, 281
 Ambikācaraṇa Devaśarmā 202
 ambujalocana 245
 Amīr 267
 Amīr Khusrau 251
 Amoghavarṣa 185
 Āmrakūṭa 186, 229
 āmrās 238
 Amṛtadatta 253, 257
 Amṛtakunḍa 251
 Amśakalā 33
 aṃśala 114
 Anabhyāśamityā 180
 Ānanda Bodha Sarasvatī 33
 Anandavallī 257
 Ānandavardhana 13, 14, 67, 68,
 215
 Anaṅga Harṣa Mātṛrāja 163
 anantā 180
 anāśrava 180
 Anasūyā 117
 Añcalagaccha 179
 Ancient Indian Historical
 Tradition 168
 Andal 252
 andhacāṭakanyāya 248
 Andhakadveṣitanūjam 68
 Andhakārāṭisutasya 68
 Andhakaśatrusūnuna 68
 Āndhra 210, 229
 Āndhras 209
 Anekārthakośa 281
 Anekārthaśabdakośa 281
 Anekārthasamuccaya 281
 Aṅga 161
 Aṅgiras 98
 Aniladūta 189, 202, 215
 Añjanādri 211, 230

- Añjanakhalapurī 231
 Añka 12
 Añkepāli 181
 añkūra 181
 Annakara 215
 anugrahadhārā 117, 118
 anumāna 7
 anumiti 7
 anupāna 276
 Anyokti 5, 28, 57, 58, 59, 61, 62,
 63, 64, 65, 66
 Aśoka 115, 122, 243
 Ap 243
 Apabhraṃśas 176
 apācī 181
 aparā 181
 aparādha 145
 Appayya Dīkṣita 67
 apratarkyavidhiyogakāritā 128
 Apsaras 44, 45
 Arabia 274
 Arabic 260
 Aravinda 185
 Arbuda 231
 Ardhanārīśvara 220
 arghya 116
 Ariṣṭanemi 29, 43, 44, 45
 Arjuna 161
 Artha 112, 129
 Arthaśāstra 167
 Arthadyotanikā 97
 arthavādas 173
 Aruṇācala 229
 Āruṇi 158, 159, 164
 Arundhati 94, 97, 98
 ārya 146
 ārya 146
 Āryaka 145, 146, 148, 150
 Āśādha 178
 Asaṅga 22, 36, 221
 Asaf Khan 255
 Āsafavilāsa 255
 Aṣṭādhyāyī 270
 aṣṭāṅga 273
 Aṣṭaṅgaḥṛdayasaṃhitā 285
 Aṣṭāṅgasaṅgraha 285
 Āśrama 42, 71, 72, 77, 86, 87, 88,
 89, 90, 92, 93, 94, 96, 97,
 118, 124
 Aśvaghoṣa 22
 Aśvamedha 75, 76, 77, 79
 Aśvattha 238
 Āśvina 218
 Aśvinau 272
 āsyā 181
 Atharvaveda 99, 240, 242, 249,
 253, 259, 282, 283
 Atharvanidhi 75, 99
 athavā bhavitavyatā 123
 atho acumbat 68
 atho aśeṣam 68
 Atithi 76, 79, 93, 95
 Ātman 32
 Ātreya 24, 25, 42, 283, 285
 Atri 103
 Aurangabad 231
 Aurangzeb 257, 259, 260, 264
 Aurangzeb Badsha 267
 Auśinārī 120
 avabhṛtha 78, 81
 Avalikhita 285
 Avanti 113, 114, 115, 157, 161,
 167, 229

Avantikā 158, 160
 Āvasathya 82
 Avatāra 267
aviravika nyāya 248
 Avyakta 266
avyaktam ekam 267
 Awadhi 261
 Ayar Danish 259
 Ayodhyā 72, 77, 86, 87, 103, 209,
 232
 Āyurveda 250, 282, 283, 286
 Āyus 90, 98
āyusyaṇi 282

B

B. N. Krishnamurti Sarma 34
 B.L. Atreya 20, 22, 23, 33, 38
 Baba Lal Das 258
 Babhru 182
 Badarikāśrama 205
 Bade Sahib 265
baghār 138
 Baghdad 250
 Baha'uddin Sahib 266
bahupāṭhas 33, 35
Bakadūta 216
 Bakula 243
Bālabodhavyākaraṇa 180
 Baladeva Upādhyāya 218
 Balanili 204
 Balsar 208
 Bālya 203
 Bāṇa 142, 270
 Bāṇa Bhaṭṭa 209
 Barkara 182
 Baroda 231

Barve/Barve Nāyikābheda 260
 Bay of Bengal 227
Bījanavāṅkura 254
 Behari Krishna Das 254
 Bengal 187, 227
Bhṛṅgadūta 206
Bhṛṅgasandeśa 204, 205
 Bhṛgupura 208, 231
 Bhaṭṭapālī 189
 Bhadra 266
 Bhadrabāhu 224
 Bhadravati 158, 164, 167
bhāgadheya 121, 125
bhāgadheyāni 125, 132
bhāgadheyeṣu 122, 124, 125, 132
Bhagavadgītā 24, 251
bhagavān 96
Bhāgavata 43
Bhāgavata-purāṇa 33, 34, 35,
 40, 217, 258, 260
 Bhagavati 192
 Bhagavatisvāmin 255
 Bhagavattva 33
bhāgya 121, 125, 126
bhāgyāni 125
bhagyaviplavād 127
bhāgyāyattam 123, 128
bhaiṣajyāni 272
 Bhakti 11, 212, 224, 225, 226
Bhaktidūta 225
Bhāminīvilāsa 254
 Bhānucandra 254
 Bhānudatta 253
 Bhānujīkṣita 281
 Bhānukara 253
 Bhattojīkṣita 67

- Bharadvāja 29, 42, 44, 45
 Bharata 11, 70, 88, 110, 117, 119, 121
 Bharatapura 205
 Bhāravi 69
 Bhartṛhari 21, 22, 23, 34, 35, 38
 Bhāsa 16, 159, 160, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166
 Bhāskarācārya 254
 Bhāskaranandin 142
bhasmas 276
Bhāṣya 37
 Bhattacharya 33, 35, 36, 40
 Bhāva 32
 Bhavabhūti 15, 16, 18, 21, 24, 25, 34, 38, 65
 Bhāvamiśra 285
 Bhavanagar 178
bhavitavyatā 121
Bhaviṣya-purāṇa 31
Bhāvprakāśa 285
 Bheḍa 274
 Bhela 284, 285
Bhelasamhitā 285
 Bhelpūri 208
 Bhikṣu 151
 Bhīmasena 225
 bhojaka 138
 Bholānātha 219
Bhramaradūta 206
Bhramarasandeśa 205
 Bhramaravilasita 247
 Bhramarī 216
 Bhujāṅgaprayāta 247
 Bilyaksetra 230
bimba 115
 Bimbali 230
 Bimbasāra 161
 BKM 162, 163, 164, 165
 Bombay 208
 Bombay Central Post Office 208
 Book of Shanāq 250
 Brahmā 42, 45, 48, 242, 245
 Brahmacārin 77
 Brahmahatyā 206
Brahmanityakarmasamuccaya 249
 Brahmāvarta 229
Brahmavidyā 265
 Braj 261, 264
Bṛhadvastumālā 249
 Bṛhaspati 206
Bṛhatkathā 163, 166
Bṛhatkathā-śloka-saṅgraha 163
Bṛhatkathā-śloka-saṅgraha 167
Bṛhatkathāmañjarī 162
Bṛhatsamhitā 251
 Broach 231
 Buddha 32, 161
 Buddhaghoṣa 162
 Buddhi 172
 Buddhism 22
buddhopāsaka 151
 Buddhasvāmin 163
 Bullimore 208
 Burhan Shah 253
- C**
- C. R. Devadhar 168
 C.S.R. Sastri 236
 Caitanya 253
Caitanyadeva 223
 Caitra 204

- cakora 172
Cakorasandēṣa 214
 Cakrapāṇidatta 284
 Cakravarti 187
 Cakravartin 88
 Calicut 231
 Caliph al-Mansur 250
 Cambodia 274
Cambridge History of India 168
 Cāṇakya 250
 Caṇḍa 157
 Caṇḍa Pradyota 161
 Cāṇḍāla 144, 148, 263
 Cāṇḍālas 138, 143, 148, 153
 Candanaka 145, 146, 147, 148
 Candra 68
 Candraṭa 284
Candradūta 179, 186, 200
 Candraprabha 179
 Candrapuṣkariṇī 211
 Cannamangala 231
 Cāra 181
 Caraka 175, 284, 285
Carakasamhitā 284, 285
caraṇakamala 245
caraṇakamala-cañcarīka 247
 Cārava 225
 Cari 181
 Cāritrasundaragaṇi 179, 224
 Carmaṇvati 77, 186, 229
caru 80
 Cārudatta 136, 137, 138, 139, 140,
 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146,
 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152
 cātaka 171
 Caturbhuja 257
 Cauvery 209
 Ceta 152
 Cetodūta 173, 179
 Ceylon 210, 211
 Chaturvedi 206
 Chennamangalam 203, 204
 Chingleput 204
 Chintaharan Chakravarti 187
 Chowpatti 208
 Chuti Khan 260
Cikitsākalikā 285
Cikitsāsārasaṅgraha 285
 Cikitsāsthāna 284, 285
 Cit 32
 Citrakūṭa 206
 Citralekhā 120
Citramīmāṃsā 67
 Citriṇī 266
cīvaras 151
 Cūḍālā 50, 53
 Cochin 215
 Cola 211, 229
 Cola country 230
 Colas 209
 Comorin 212
 Conjeevaram 204, 209, 211
 Cranganur 212
 cuckoo 171
 Cullavagga 167
 Cupid 51, 53
 Cūrṇī 230, 231
 Cyavana 89, 98

D

- Dadar 208
daiva 121, 126

- daivagatyā* 126
daivam asyāḥ pratikūlam
śamayitum 123
daivasyānukampanīyā 122
daivayogād 126
daivena 124
 Dākinīs 46
 Dakṣa 105, 109
 Dākṣāyaṇī 73, 91, 105
 Dakṣiṇa 82
dakṣiṇā 116
 Dakṣiṇāgni 72, 73
 Dakṣiṇamārga 222
 Dakṣiṇāvartanātha 236
 Dalapati 254
 Ḍallaṇa 274
 Damascus 250
 Damayanti 170, 171
 Dāmodara Gupta 162
Dānāśhāh Carita 254
dandahyamāna 68
dandakuṇḍikābhājana 151
 Danyal 254
 Dara Shikoh 255, 258, 264, 265
 Daraf Khan 268
 Darśaka 158, 161, 166
 Darbha 81
 Darduraka 136, 139, 144
 Daśapura 186, 208, 229
 Daśaratha 14, 44, 74, 75, 76, 78,
 80, 87, 95, 109, 110, 112,
 225, 244
 Daśārṇa 186, 229
 Dāsūra 55
 Date of Bhartṛhari 40
 Datta 266
dausyanti 70
 Delhi 189
 Deoria 222
Deśināmamālā 282
 Deuce 138
 Devadāru 238
 Devadhar 132
 Devadūta 43, 44, 45, 169
 Devagiri 186, 229, 231
 Devarṣigrāma 222
 Dhammapada 162
 Dhanañjaya 281
 Dhanapāla 282
 Dhanvantari 283
 Dharaṇīndra 186
 Dhārīṇī 119, 120
 Dharma 112, 129, 182
 Dharmasūtras 65
Dhātupārāyaṇa 180
 Dhoi 187
 Dhūtā 150
 Dhoyi 186, 187
 Dhūyi 187
 Dhoyika 187
 Dhurail 266
 Dhvani 5, 7, 8
 Dhvani School 7
Dhvanyāloka 19, 215
dhyāna 90
 Dīkṣā 179
 Dilīpa 70, 75, 78, 79, 90, 92, 93,
 94, 95, 109, 110, 111, 112,
 113, 114, 115, 238
dilīpanandanah 70
dilīpasūnoh 70
Dīrghasātra 79

- Diṣṭa 182
 Diu 231
 Divākara 228
 Divanji 32
Divya-Jyotiḥ 189
dodhūyamāna 68
dohada 243
Dohāvalī 260
 Dṛḍhabala 284
dūṣaṇa 139
dūṣita 139
dūta 171
dūtakāvya 17, 172, 174, 176, 177, 178, 179, 184, 201, 204, 205, 208, 218, 222, 223, 228
dūtakāvyas 171, 172, 175, 177, 188, 201, 202, 204, 211, 212, 213, 215, 219, 220, 221, 225, 227, 228, 229
 Dr. Atreya 27
 Dr. Bhandarkar 168
 Draupadī 222
drona 139
 Drutavilambita 28
 Duḥśāsana 222
 Durgā 203, 220
 Durvāsas 86, 91, 109, 117, 171
 Duryodhana 16, 222
 Duṣyanta 18, 70, 71, 73, 74, 90, 91, 92, 94, 95, 96, 105, 109, 113, 116, 117, 118, 119, 122, 123, 124, 128, 132, 171
 Dvādaśāvarta 190
dvandva 142
dvandvātmikā (srṣṭiḥ) 10
Dvārakā 221, 223
dvārbhāva 138
Dvātrīṃśatputtalikāsimhāsana 259
 Dvīpapurī 231
 Dvija 224
dvirepha 247
Dvirūpa 282

E
 Eastern Coast 210
 Egypt 227
Ekākṣarakośa 272
 Ekārṇava 46, 48, 49
 Elements 251
 Euclid 251

F
 F.E. Pargiter 167
 Faizi 259
 Faqirullah 259
 Faras Khan 266
 Fariduddin Shakarganj 253
 Faruqui 257
 Feroz 265
 France 227

G
 G. J. Somayāji 236
 Gacchanāyaka 179
gajagāminī 246
 Gajagati 247
 Gajendragadkar 132
 Gālava 92
gamaka 8
 Gambhīrā 186, 229
gananya 8

- ganḍa* 138
Gaṇḍakī 229
Gandhamādāna 128
Gandharva 187
Gaṇeśa 207
Gaṅgā 51, 69, 209, 238, 268
Gaṅgādhara 253, 254, 259
Gaṅgālaharī 254
Gaṅgāstotra 268
Ganges 205
Garbhaka 181
Gārhapatya 72, 73, 82
Garja 181
Garuḍa 210
gātra 181
Gauḍa Abhinanda 20, 27, 31, 32, 36
Gauḍamaṇḍala 267
Gauḍapāda 21
Gauḍapāda Kārikā 24
Gauḍavaho 70
Gauragṛpāla Śīromaṇi 215
Gaurāṅga 226
Gaurī Temple 47
Gautamī 18, 73, 99
gavākṣa 248
Gayadāsa 284
Gītā 219
Gesu Daraz 265
Ghaṭakarpara 228
Ghaṭakarpara-Yamaka-Kāvya 201, 228
Ghaṭakarparakāvya 186
ghaṭapradīpanyāya 8
Ghazni 250
Ghulam Ali Azad Bilgiramī 259
ghuṇākṣaranyāya 248
ghūtkāra 24
Gibraltar 227
giriḥ 25
giriśa 68
giriśagaurūtanayena 70
Gūḍhamārga 181
Godāvarī 209, 229, 238
Gohira 181
Gokula 221, 223, 228
Golcunda 265
Gomedha 77
Gomukha 248
Gopāla 164, 267
Gopati 181
Gopendranātha 226
Gopī 207, 217
Gopīdūta 220
Gopikānta Bhaṭṭācārya 200
Gopīs 17, 201, 207, 210, 211, 213, 215, 217, 218, 219, 220, 225, 226, 227
goruta 248
gostanī 248
goṣṭhī 248
gotra 88
Govardhana 210, 218
Govinda Rāma Śarmā 208
Govindabhaṭṭa 254
Greeks 175
Guṇādhyā 163
Guṇadūta 225
Guṇakāpuram 230
Guṇakāpurī 230
Guṇapuram 213
Guṇas 266

Guccha 181
Guha 263
Guhaniyogī 184
Gujarat 221
Gundala 181
Guptas 37
Gurjarendra 254
Gurraṭ-i-viz-Zijat 259
Guru Pūrṇimā 208

H

H. C. Norman 168
Haji Ibrahim Sarhindi 259
Hāla 214
Halāyudha 271
Hammīra 267
haṁsa 170, 171
Hamsadūta 209, 210
hamsagati 246
Hamsasandeśa 211, 212
Hanumat 200, 206, 210
Hārāvali 271
Haravijaya 70
Hari 183, 258
Haridāsa 202
Harihara Bhaṭṭa 221
Harimohana 202
hariṇākṣī 246
Hariṇapluta 247
Harinārāyaṇa Mīśra 253, 256
Hariṇī 86, 101, 109, 110, 112, 247
Harivamśa 259
Harṣa 162, 166
Harṣacarita 209
Hastināpura 71, 161, 222
Hastinī 266

Hastiśaila 211, 230
havirbhuj 73
havis 79
Heiuntsang 30
Helārāja 35
Hemacandra 162, 281, 282
Hemādri 275
Himālaya 73, 96, 98, 205, 238
Himālayas 178, 209
Hiṅgu 145
History of Ancient India 167
Hūṇas 22
homa 78, 79
Hosaladeśa 230
hoṭṛ 75
Hoysala kingdom 204
Hṛdayadūta 221
Hussain Shah 259
Hussaini Brahmins 253

I

Ibn al-Nadim 250
Ibrahim al-Fazari 250
Īhāmrga 13
ijyā 75, 78
Ikṣvāku 93
Ikṣvākus 78, 126
Imam Shahi 253
Indian Historical Quarterly 218
Indo-Bactrians 37
Indo-Greeks 37
Indra 43, 44, 54, 68, 75, 78, 110, 121, 167, 205, 206
Indraprastha 189
Indrapurī 205
Indreśa 221

Indreśa Bhaṭṭa 221
 Indriyasthāna 284
Indudūta 179, 190, 191
 Indumatī 17, 101, 109, 112, 114,
 126, 127, 243
 Īṅgudī 232
 Irāvati 121, 122
 Iringalakkut 231
 Ispinder Khan 267
iṣṭanāśa 11, 12
iṣṭi 78
 Italy 227
 Itihāsa 273
 Itsing 23

J

J. B. Chaudhury 236
 Jagaddurlabha 220
 Jagannātha Paṇḍitarāja 253
 Jagannātha Triśūli 263
 Jahangir 258
 Jahiz Ibn 250
 Jahnukṣetra 205
Jaina Meghadūta 178, 179, 180
 Jaipur 221
 Jaiyaṭa 274
 Jālandhara 231
 Jalapralaya 49
 Jalhaṇa 187
 Jalor 231
 Jambūkavi 186, 200
 Janaka 44, 53, 54, 76, 78, 87, 95,
 98
 Jaraf Khan 268
 Jarṇa 182
 Jātakas 32

Jaṭāyu 244
 Jayadeva 26
 Jayantamaṅgala 231
 Jīvaka 283
jīvanmukta 43
 Jehan 254
 Jehangir 254
 Jejunee Chronicles 161
 Jinasena 179, 184
 Jineśa 188
Jitakalpāsāra 180
 Jodhpur 231
 Juhu Beach 208

K

K. B. Pathak 236
 K.S. 67, 68, 70
 Kabandha 112
 Kabir 253
 Kacchapa dynasty 257
 Kadamba 55, 210
kadambagolakanyāya 248
Kādambarī 19, 209, 254
 Kailāsa 49, 205, 209, 214, 229
 Kailāsadhāma 207
 Kairavas 53
kākadantagaveśaṇanyāya 248
Kākadūta 215
 Kākali 147
kākatālīyanyāya 248
 Kakkasson 203
 Kāla 86, 229
kalahakelikutūhalotkam 68
 Kalahamśa 247
 Kāla-hasti-mandira 229
 Kālībhīṭi 225

- Kāliprasāda 225
 Kale 132
 Kalhaṇa's Chronicles of Kashmir 30
kalhāras 55
 Kālidāsa 17, 18, 22, 23, 38, 67, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 85, 86, 88, 89, 92, 96, 98, 99, 100, 108, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 118, 119, 121, 124, 125, 126, 128, 136, 170, 171, 173, 174, 175, 177, 178, 179, 180, 183, 184, 191, 202, 204, 205, 215, 217, 221, 228, 237
Kālidāsagranthāvalī 81, 100
Kalilah Damnah 259
 Kalimullah Hussain 265
 Kālīṅga 126, 229
 Kālīya 210
 Kālīyadamana 247
 Kalpa 284
 Kalpas 283
kalpas 286
 Kalpasthāna 285
kalyavarta 138, 139
 Kāma 17, 110, 112, 118, 127, 128, 129
 Kamaṭha 185, 186
kamalalocana 245
kamalapatrākṣī 246
 Kamalavardhana 30
 Kamana 181
 Kāmārāmā 213, 232
Kāmasūtra 265
 Kampā 209, 230
 Kaṁsa 153, 220
Kaṁsavaho 70
 Kanaka 229
 Kanakaśakti 141
 Kanakamukharī 209, 210, 229, 230
 Kanakapuri 187
 Kanakhala 229
 Kāñcī 212, 229, 230
 Kāñcīpura 211, 229
 Kandarapalekhā 209
 Kaniṣka 274
 Kanpur 189
 Kaṇṭhiyūr 232
 Kaṇva 17, 71, 72, 73, 86, 87, 88, 89, 91, 92, 94, 95, 96, 97, 99, 115, 117, 123, 128
kapāṭavakṣāḥ 114
 Kapha 286
 Kapila 76
 Kapilabala 284
kapota 11
karakamala 245
 Karavira 153
 Karinnampilly 212
 Karman 32, 78, 212
 Kaṇṭāṭaka 210
 Kaṇṭābharaṇa 259
kaṇṭātakalahaprayoga 146
 Kaṇṭikāra 80, 243
Karpūramañjarī 39
Karṣū 181
 Kartarpur 221
 Kārtavīrya 76
 Kārttikeya 70
 Karuṇa 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18

- Kāruṇya 43, 44, 45
 Kāsara 69
 kaṣāya 151
 Kāśi 258
 kaṣṭatapas 105
 Kāṣṭhā 181
 kāṣṭhaṣadhas 286
 Kāśyapa 95
 kaṭa 138
 Katalaturuttu 230
 Kathāsaritsāgara 162
 kaṭhora 25
 Kaṭīra 181
 kattā 138
 Kātyāyana 271
 Kaumudī 214
 Kauravas 222
 Kauśāmbī 157, 158, 159, 161
 Kauśikī 120, 122
 Kautsa 72, 73, 74, 94, 116
 Kāverī 203, 229, 230, 238
 kavikṣmābhṛtā 187
 kavinarapati 187
 Kavīndra Parameśvara 260
 Kavirāja 187
 Kāvyaṃālā 190, 191
 kāvyānumiti 7
 Kāvyaṃprakāśa 9, 200
 Kāvyaṃvṛttiprabhoda 255
 Kāyastha 140, 149
 Kila 181
 Kīradūta 213
 Kīrtisamullāsa 254
 Keśava 121, 285
 Keśavasvāmin 281
 Kēraḷa 230, 231
 Kesara 115
 Khaṭī 181
 Khagapati 188
 Khalapurī 231
 khalekapotanyāya 248
 Khalīkriyate 139
 Khambhat 221
 Khan-i-Khana 262, 263
 Khandesh 257
 Kharu 181
 Kharzim 250
 Khecara 188
 Kheṭakautuka 260, 261, 262
 Khirad Afza-Namah 259
 Khurram 254
 King Burhan Shah 257
 King Divodāsa 275
 King Jallala 254
 King Pṛthu 242
 King Shahabuddin 257
 King Vikramāditya 271
 Kinnaras 63
 Kokasandēśa 213, 236
 Kokiladūta 202
 Kokilasandēśa 202, 203, 215
 Koladeśa 231
 Kolambadeśa 230
 Kośā 224
 Kośas 279, 280
 Kūpaka 230
 Kosala 161
 Kotah 221
 Kottayam 231, 232
 kratu 76, 78, 79
 Krauñca 99, 209
 krauñcācala 25

Krauñcaparvata 229
kriyā 78
Krodha 172
kṛpīṭayoni 69
 Kṛṣṇa 17, 153, 189, 201, 202, 207,
 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 215,
 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222,
 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228,
 253
 Kṛṣṇā 203
 Kṛṣṇamūrti Śarmā 216
 Kṛṣṇanagara 216
 Kṛṣṇanātha 188
 Kṛṣṇavatī 209
 Kṛṣṇavenī 229
kṛtānta 121, 126
 Kṛtavarman 210
 Kṣaireyī 181
 Kṣattā 181
 Kṣemadhanvan 75
 Kṣemendra 162, 166
 Kṣīrakaṇṭha 181
 Kṣīrasindhunadī 230
 Kṣīrasvāmin 271
 KSS 162, 163, 164, 165, 166
 Kubera 109, 177
 Kubjā 220
 Kūkada 181
 Kukkuṭakroḍa 231
 Kulagurus 93, 94
 Kulapati 97
 Kulapurī 230
 Kumāra 68, 70, 266
 Kumāra Kārtikeya 141
 Kumārapāla 231
Kumārapālāpratibodha 162

Kumārasambhava 17, 67, 73, 82,
 127, 171
Kumārasantoṣinī 132
 Kumbha 50
 Kundadanta 47, 48
 Kuppuswami 168
 Kurarī 18
 Kuravakas 115
 Kuru 222
 Kurukṣetra 209, 229
 Kurumbavana 231
 Kuśa 71, 72, 77, 79, 89, 93, 95
 Kuśāvati 150
 Kusumapura 202, 203
kvātha 286
kvaṭkāra 24

L

La ilahi 267
 La ilahi al-Allah 267
Laghuśatapadī 180
Laghujātaka 251
 Lakṣaṇā 7
 Lakṣmaṇa 14, 18, 44, 74, 86, 87,
 118, 119
 Lakṣmaṇasena 187, 230
 Lakṣmī 50, 121, 190, 245
 Lakṣmīdāsa 204, 212
 Lakṣmīnārāyaṇapura 230
 Lakṣmīpati 253, 257, 261
lakṣyasupta 138
 Lalitā 209, 211
 Lāmakāyana 165
 Lambodara Vaidya 220
 Laṅkā 72, 103, 192, 200, 206,
 226, 230

Later Life of Rāma 40

Lava 89, 95

Lavaṇa 74

Lāvāṇaka 158, 164, 166

Lavaṅgi 255

Lectures on Ancient History of

India 167, 168

lelihāna 68

Līlāvalī 255, 259

Locana 214

Lokabhadra 232

Lokapālas 121

Lolimbarāja 286

Lotus Sutra 245

M

M.R. Kale 105, 106, 132

Madanāṣṭaka 260, 262

Madanikā 50, 51, 137, 139, 149,
150, 152

Madhava Singh 257

Mādhavakara 275

Mādhavakavindra 217

Mādhavasena 122

Mādhavi 115

Mādhaviṃṇḍapa 123

Madhopur 225

madhukara 247

Madhupura 189

Madhurā 203, 214

Madhuravāṇi 208

Madras 204

Madras Presidency 210

Madurā 209, 229

Magadha 55, 158, 159, 160, 161,

165, 166, 167, 202

Māgha 69

Mahābhārata 28, 33, 34, 161,
170, 171, 237, 246, 249, 258,
259, 260, 274

Mahābhāṣya 79, 175, 283

mahābhujah 114

mahākratau 79

mahākratoḥ 79

Mahāliṅga Śāstrī 205

Maharṣi 95, 96, 98

Mahāsena 157, 159, 160, 163, 167

Mahāśvetā 16

Mahātmā Gandhi 189

Mahāvīra 231

Mahāvyyutpatti 282

maheśādhisutāsutasya 70

Maheśamahānanda 259

Mahendra 49, 203

Mahendraprabhasūri 179

Maheśvara 281

Mahī 231

Mahimabhṭṭa 5, 7, 8

Mahiṣanagara 216

Mahodayapurī 230

Majjhima Nikāya 162

Majmul Bahrain 264

Makaradhvajasaṭrusūnum 69

makha 78, 79

Māla 229

Malabar 203, 204, 212, 213

Mālādharī Devaprabha 162

Mālava 52, 208

Mālavikā 120, 121, 122

Mālavikāgnimitra 120, 121, 125

Malaya 203, 209, 229, 230

Malayācaladeśa 187

- Malayagiri 202
Malayakūṭa 203
 Malayalam 204, 215
 Malayavat 210, 229, 230
 Malhaṇa 285
 Mālinī 28
 Malita 32
 Mallikāmāruta 203
 Mallinātha 67, 68, 99, 236
 Mālyavat 200
 Mammaṭa 67, 68, 133
 Manalor 230
 Maṇaṅlūr 230
 Mānasa Lake 205, 229
 Māṇḍakaṛṇi 85
 Maṇḍapa 225
 Mandāra 52
 Mandasore Stone Pillar Inscription
 of Yaśodharman 25
 Mandsore 208
Māṇḍūkya Kārikās 21
 Manikaṇṭha temple 232
 Maṅkha 271
Manmathamardanātmajam 69
Manmathaśatrusūnūnā 69
Manodūta 179, 221, 222, 223
manomayūra 247
mantraḥṛt 75
Manu/Manusmṛti 81, 72, 130, 149
 Mārīca 71, 73, 86, 88, 91, 92, 94,
 95, 96, 97, 105, 115, 117, 124
 Marica 145
 Marīci 105, 255
 Marubhūti 185, 186
Maruddūta 189
Marut-Skandhas 63
 Marwar 179
 Maṭha 31
 Māṭṭdallapaṇḍita 205
 Māṭṭrāja Anaṅga Harṣa 160
 Mataṅga 109, 126
 Mātali 105
 Mathurā 17, 201, 209, 210, 211,
 217, 219, 220, 221, 222, 227,
 228
 Mattāḷamba 182
 Mattamayūra 247
 Maulana Hussain Waiz 259
 Maulana Imamuddin 259
 Mauryans 37
 Māyāpura 225
 Mayūra 280
Mayūrasaṇḍeśa 203, 214
mīnākṣī 246
 Mecca 258
 Medinīkara 281
Medinīkośa 281
 Mediterranean Sea 227
megha 139
Meghābhyaudaya 183
Meghadautyam 184
Meghadūta 16, 18, 19, 22, 23, 24,
 73, 77, 82, 126, 170, 171,
 173, 174, 175, 177, 178, 179,
 180, 183, 184, 185, 186, 191,
 202, 203, 204, 205, 206,
 207, 208, 209, 211, 212, 215,
 217, 221, 223, 224, 227, 228,
 236
Meghadūta-chāyā-kāvya 191
Meghapuṣpa 182
 Meghavijaya 179
 Menakā 85, 87, 91, 117
 Meru 42, 49, 51, 52

Merutuṅga 178, 179, 180
 Mir 257
miśravṛtta 13
 Mirza Fakhruddin 259
 Mirza Rawshan Zamir 259
 Mithilā 87
 Moca 182
 Moha 172
 Mokṣa 129
Mr̥cchakaṭika 134, 142, 162
mṛcchakaṭika 143
mṛgaśāvākṣī 246
Mṛgavāṭicaritra 162
 Mūrcchanās 145
 Mūrkhadeva 227
 Mount Malayavat 230
 Mudgara 227
Mudgaradūta 227
 Mudira 182
 Muhammed Shah 257, 266
 Muinuddin Chishti 253
 Muizuddin Muhammad bin Sam
 267
 Mukalamah-i-Baba Lal Das 258
 Mulla Sadullah Masih 258
 Mumtaz Mahal 256
 Muni 86, 95, 96
 Muni Chaturavijaya 178
 Munīśvara 255
 Muquammal Khan Gujarati 259
 Murāri 280
 Mysore 204

N

Nāḍi 182
 Nāḍī 237
 Nāḍī Vrat Shastri Collection, New Delhi. Digitized by S3 Foundation USA

Nadir Shah 259
Nagara-śobhā 260
 Nāgarāja 186
 Nāgārjuna 22, 284
 Nāgavana 157
 Nagna 182
 Nagpur 206
 Nahuṣa 86
Naiśadhīyacarita 17
 Naiyāyika 226
nākhudā 267
 Nala 17, 170, 171
 Naladamayanti 259
 Naladevi 179
 Nalakūbara 109
Naldaman 259
Nāmalingānuśāsana 281
Nāmamālā 281
 Namaz 258
 Nānak 253
Nānārthārṇavasankṣepa 281
 Nanda 207
 Nandalāla 267
 Nandana 54
 Nandargikar 81
 Nandi 182
 Nandimukhī 182
 Nandini 78, 92, 94, 112
 Nandyāvarta 182
 Nani 178, 179
 Nārada 44, 101, 164, 165
narapuṅgava 246
naraṣabha 246
naraśārdūla 246
narasiṃha 246
naravyāghra 246

Nārāyaṇa 264
nardita 138
 Narmadā 192, 229, 230, 231
Nartananirṇaya 254
 Nāsadiya 49
 Nasarulla Mustafa 259
 Nasir Shah 259
 Naṭagiri 167
 Nāṭaka 134
 Nāṭikā/Nāṭikās 134, 166
 Nāṭyaśāstra 11, 18
navvittaka 267
 Navādhiṣṭhāna 30
 Navadvīpa 213, 216, 226, 227
 Navaratnas 175
 Navasari 208
 Navīna Patañjali 214
 Navīsariha 225
 Navyaraṅgapurī 231
 Nawab Asaf Khan 255
 Nawab Tana Shah 265
 Nāyakas 266
 Nāyikā 266
 Nāyikās 265
 Nilā 231
 Nilakaṇṭha 254
nīlāmbujaśyamalakomalāṅgam
 245
 Nīlaśaila 226
Nītisāra 254
Nemidūta 174, 221
 Neminātha 178, 179, 221
 nether region 79
netrakamala 245
Netranārāyaṇīya 231
 New York 227

Nidānasthāna 284, 285
Nighaṇṭus 279, 282
Nighaṇṭuśeṣa 271
nigrahadhārā 117, 118
nimba 227
Nirguṇa viśiṣṭamārga 222
Nirukta 279
 Nirvāṇa 32
 Nirvindhya 186, 229
 Niṣka 182
 Niṣkalaṅka 253
Niṣṣṭārthadūtī 255
 Nityānanda 255
niyati 121
 Nizam Shah 253
 Nizam Shahi 253
 Nizamuddin Aulia 253
 Nṛsimha 32
Nodya 182
 Nur Jehan 255
 Nuruddin Feroze 267
 Nūtanādhiṣṭhāna 30, 31
 Nyāyaparibhāṣās 228
nyāyas 248

O

Om̐kāra 225
 Onomatopoeia in the
 Yogavāsiṣṭha 39
 Oṣadhiprastha 205

P

P. C. Divanji 24, 26, 27, 28, 29,
 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 36, 38, 39
 P. D. Gune 168
 P.K. Gode 264

- pādābjabhṛṅga* 247
pādāmbuja 245
Padāṅkadūta 200, 227
Pādapadūta 226
pādapaṅkaja 245
Padmā 263
Padmadūta 188, 226
Padmanābha 203
Padmanābhasvāmī 204
Padmapāṇi 245
padmapalāśākṣī 246
Padma-purāṇa 97
Padmāvati 158, 159, 160, 161, 165, 166, 167
Padmini 265, 266
Padyāmṛtatarāṅgiṇī 256
Pākima 182
Pakṣin 182
Pālaka 150
Pampar 31
Panabokke 236
pañcāgnisādhana 81
pañcagrāsas 244
Pāñcāla 158, 164, 266
Pañcamahābhūtas 243, 244
Pañcānana 188
Pañcāpsaras 229
Pañcatantra 137, 173, 259
Pañcavaṭi 15, 229
Pāṇḍavas 157, 222
paṇḍitapuṅgava 246
Paṇḍitarāja/ Paṇḍitarāja
Jagannātha 57, 66, 254, 256, 257
Pāṇḍya (king/s) 209, 214, 229, 230
Pāṇḍya country 230
Pāṇḍyadeśa 211
Pāṇini 280
Pānthadūta 219
pārada 286
Paragal Khan 260
Parakīyā 266
paramārthasupta 138
Pārasikas 33
Pārasiprakāśa 254, 255, 282
Paraśurāma 86, 87, 98
Pargiter 33, 34, 40, 168
Pārijāta 17
Parivrājikā 165
Pārśvābhhyudaya 179, 184
Pārśvanātha 185, 186, 231
Pārvatī 70, 77, 98, 110, 111, 118, 128, 171, 209, 238
Pasenadi 161
Pāśupata 31
Paśupatikṣetra 230
Pātāla 79, 192
Patan 179
Pataṇagavṛtti 166
Patañjali 79, 283
pāṭha 138
Pāṭisāra 255
Patradūta 208
Patrapāla 182
Pauraka 182
Paurava 161
Pavanadūta 174, 186, 187
pāvāra 138
Peñjūṣa 182
Periyar 230
Persian 260, 261

- Persian Gulf 227
 Perusūri 214
 Phullā 230
Phuṭakar pada 260
Pikadūta 201, 202
 Pilu 182
 Pīṭala 182
Pitta 286
 Porkal 231
 Porwal 179
prabalākin 25
 Prabodha 172
Prabodhacandrodaya 172
 Pracetas 79
 Pradeśa 229
 Pradyota 157, 158, 161, 162, 167, 168
 Pradyumnaśikhara 31
prajālopanimīlitaḥ 75
 Prajāpati 109
 Prakaraṇa 134
 Prakāśadeśa 231
 Prakrits 176
 Praṇāyā 182
praṇidhāna 90
praphulla 68
 Prasenajit 161
 Prātaśvenapura 225
 Pratigha 182
Pratijñā/Pratijñāyau-gan-dharāyaṇa 163, 164
pratikūladaivāt 127
 pratipurūṣa 138
 Pravara-pura 30, 31
 Pravarasena II 30
 Prayāga 160, 165, 166, 189, 190, 222, 243
 Preyas 11
Priyadarśikā 162
 Priyamvada 109, 110, 112, 126
 Priyamvadā 117
priyānuprasādana 120
 protective rosary 88
 Pṛthivī 243
 Pṛthu 242
 Ptolemy 251
Pulomaputrīdayitaḥ 69
 Punarvasu Ātreya 284
 Puṇḍarika 16
 Puṇḍarika Viṭṭhala 253, 254, 257
 Puṇḍarikapura 209
Puṇḍarika 182
puṅgava 246
 Puṇyārāja 40
 Purāṇa 283
Purāṇa Texts of the Dynasties of the Kali Age 40
 Purāṇādhiṣṭhāna 31
 Puralī 231
Purārisūnoḥ 69
 Pūrṇasarasvatī 211, 236
 Puru 161
 Puruha 182
 Purūravas 121
 Puruṣārthas 112, 129
puruṣasimha 246
 Puruṣottama 110, 121
 Puruṣottamadeva 281
 Pūtanā 220
puṭapāka 15
 Putreṣṭi 75

Q

- Quilon 230, 232
Quraish of Mecca 250
Qutb Shahi 265

R

- R. D. Bhandarkar 167
Rādhā 201, 202, 209, 210, 211,
217, 219, 220, 227, 228, 263
Rāga 145
Rāgadarpaṇa 259
Rāgamañjarī 257
Rāgapura 225
Rāghavabhaṭṭa 97
Raghavan 36
Raghu 70, 72, 73, 74, 75, 77, 80,
94, 112, 113, 114, 126
Raghunāthadāsa 211
Raghurāma Rāya 227
Raghuvamśa 13, 17, 18, 19, 52,
73, 74, 76, 81, 82, 92, 99,
100, 118, 124, 126, 238, 249
Rahīma-kāvya 260, 262
Rahim 264
Rājā Kṛṣṇacandra 213
Rājadrāṅga 231
Rājaśekhara 26
Rājagrha 165
Rājamātā 221
Rājānaka Mahimabhaṭṭa 7
rājarṣi 96
Rajasthan 179
Rājatarāṅgiṇī 30, 31, 259
Rājavallabha Miśra 218
Rājimati 179

rakṣākaṇḍaka 88, 117

Rāma 14, 15, 16, 42, 43, 44, 45,
72, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 86,
87, 89, 98, 99, 103, 112, 118,
119, 127, 153, 188, 189, 200,
206, 211, 226

Rāma Dayālu Tarkaratna 189, 202

Rāma-stories 42

Rāmaśarmā 223

Rāmacandra 208, 254

Rāmadāsa Bhūpāla 254

Rāmagiri 178, 185, 227, 228, 229

Rāmagopāla 213

Rāmajivana Maulika 267

Rāmaji 225

Ramākānta Śarmā 208

Rāmānanda 253

Rāmānuja 210, 253

Rāmasetu 213

Rāmāvatāra Śarmā 227

Rāmavinoda 254

Rāmāyaṇa 12, 13, 14, 15, 19, 28,
29, 30, 34, 42, 43, 89, 188,
206, 210, 258

Rambhā 109

Rameśacandra Śānta Śālihāsa 189

Ramendra Mohan Bose 132

Rāmeśvaram 212, 213, 230

Rāmeśvaram Setubandha 229, 230

Ramyā 232

Raṇāditya 31

Raṇakhala 231

Raṅganātha 203

Raṅgas 209

Rantideva 77

Rāṣṭrakūṭa dynasty 185

Rasa 5, 10, 11
Rasagaṅgādhara 254
Rasakalpadruma 257, 260
Rasul 266
ratānandasukhasya 68
Rati 17, 51, 127
Ratnapurī 208
Ratnāvalī 161, 162, 166 ~
Rāvaṇa 109, 110, 153, 188
Ravidāsa 253
Rāyamukūṭa 281
Razmnamah 258
Rebhila 145
Red Sea 227
Revatī 208
Rewa Prasad Dwivedī 81, 100
Rohasena 143, 151
Rohiṇī 109, 207, 231
Romans 175
Roza 258
Rudra 206
Rudra Kavi 254
Rudra Nyāyapañcānana 201
Rudrabhakti 212
Rudradeva Tripāṭhī 208
Rudrakavi 253
Rugviniścaya 285
Rumaṇvat 164, 167
Rūpagosvāmin 209, 211, 217,
233, 235
Rūpaka/s 12, 13, 134

R

Ṛgveda 19, 35, 49, 99
Rṣabha 167
rṣabha 246

Rṣabhadāsa 221
Rṣi 85, 88, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96
Rṣikumārakas 96
Rṣikumāras 71, 91, 95, 96, 97
Rṣimaṇḍala 180
Rṣis 71, 74, 77, 85, 86, 87, 88, 92,
94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 103,
105
Rṭurāja 53
Rtusamhāra 126
Rtvijis 71, 80, 81

Ś

Śabda Brahman 21, 23
Śabdakalpadruma 249
Śabdārṇava 281
Śacī 205, 206
Śaddarśanasamuccaya 180
Śailasutātanūjah 68
śailātmajā 70
Śakāra 138, 140, 145, 149, 151,
152
Śaktibhadra 168
Śakuni 222
Śakuntalā 17, 18, 70, 72, 73, 85,
86, 87, 88, 89, 91, 92, 99,
108, 110, 111, 112, 117, 118,
119, 123, 124, 132, 171, 237
śākuntaleya 70
Śāla 114
śālaprāṁśu 114
Śambaradesa 23
Śambaradeśa 231
śampā 183
Śaṅkara 21, 33, 34, 36, 37, 168,
228

- Śaṅkarācārya 21, 34
 Śaṅkaradeva 253
 Śaṅkhinī 266
 Śānta/Śānta Rasa 11, 43
 Śāntākārā 232
 Śāntinātha 187
 Śāntipura 227
 śāpa 108, 112, 116
 Śarabhaṅga 77, 86
 Śāradvata 18, 94, 116
 Śaraṇadeva 67
 Śārdūlalalita 247
 Śārdūlavikrīḍita 28, 247
 Śārīrasthāna 284, 285
 Śārṅgadhara 285
 Śārṅgadharapaddhati 187
 Śārṅgarava 18, 94, 99, 113, 116
 Śarvilaka 137, 138, 140, 143, 147,
 150
 Śāśvata 281
 Śatakratu 75
 Śatamakhapurī 203
 Śatānīka 161
 Śataśloka 285
 Śatrughna 44
 Śatruñjaya 231
 Śeṣanāga 203
 Śikhidhvaja 50, 51, 52, 53
 śīla 172
 Śīladūta 179, 224
 Śīlaratna 178
 Śīśutoṣinī 69
 Śiva 17, 70, 77, 86, 96, 98, 109,
 110, 111, 118, 171, 207, 209,
 220, 232, 238
 Śleṣānthapadaśaṅgraha 280
 śloka 13
 śoka 11, 13, 14
 Śreṇika 161, 168
 śreṣṭhicatvara 147
 Śrīharṣa 17, 160, 162, 209, 280
 Śrī Nārāyaṇa Bhaṭṭapāda 205
 Śricaitanya 209
 Śrikaṇṭha 215
 Śrīkaranandin 260
 Śrīkṛṣṇa 206, 219, 222, 254
 Śrīkṛṣṇa Sārvabhauma 227
 Śrīkṛṣṇa Tarkālankāra 200
 Śrīkṣetra 227
 Śrīmadbhāgavata 17, 210
 Śrīraṅgam 229, 230
 Śrīvihārapura 213
 Śrīṅgāra 13
 Śrīṅgaradīpikā 209
 Śrīṅgāramañjarī 265, 266
 Śrīṅgārasoraṭhā 260
 Śūdraka 134, 135, 162, 168
 Śūdras 149
 śūla 77
 Śūnya 32
 Śūnyavāda 22
 Śramaṇa 151
 Śravaṇa 109, 110
 Śreṣṭhin 140, 149
 Śrutis 52
 śuṣkakalaha 146
 Śukasandeśa 203, 204, 212, 215
 Śunakadūta 216
 Śvetaśaila 211, 230
 Śvetadurga 205
 Śvetāranya 231

S

S. K. Balvelkar 40
 S.P. Chaturvedi 206
 Sabarmati 231
 Sabhika 136, 138, 139
 Sābhramatī 231
 Sabhya 82
 Sacandrā 232
 Sadhu Ram 38, 40
Saduktikarṇāmṛta 187
Sāgarikā 161
 Sahakāra 128
Sāhityadarpaṇa 12, 19
 Sahya 49, 203, 230
 Sahyaparvata 230
 Saiyad Ali-al Hujwiri 254
sajjanam janam 28
sakhā 95
sakṛtpraja 61
Sāmānyā 266
 samasyāpūrti 174, 179, 185
 Sāmśaśiva Śāstrī 205
 Saṁhitā 284, 285
 Saṁhitās 283
 Saṁjñu 183
Sāṁkhyakārikā 251
 Sampātī 244
 Samrāt 166
Saṁsārāvarta 281
saṁsthāpanā 139
Samudrasaṅgama 258, 264
 Saṁvāhaka 138, 139, 152
samyak 81
Saṁyutta-Nikāya 167
 Sandhi-bhedas 141

Saṅgamagrāma 231
Saṅgītapārijāta 259
Saṅgrāmadeva 30
Saṅjīvanī 67
saṅkrandana 69
Sāṅkṛtyāyanī 165
 Sānumatī 15, 123, 124
 Saptagrāma 268
Saptaikabhāṣyaṭīkā 180
 Sarasvatī 229, 231
Sārasvatī Suśamā 216
 Sarayū 76, 77, 229
 Sarvadamana 88, 90, 132
 Sarvānanda 281
Sarvasiddhāntarāja 255
 Satī 150, 151
 Sattrā 183
 Satya Vrat Shastri 40
 Sātyaki 210
 Satyavatī 89
 Satyavatikṣetra 211
 Satyavratākṣetra 230
savanakarman 74
 Sāyaṇa 35
 seers 96
 Senā 253
 Senāpatīs 147
 service 91
sevā 91
 Shah Inayat Shah Kalandar 253
 Shah Jehan 255, 256
 Shakespeare 174
 Shayesta Khan 257, 260, 267
 Sher Shah 253
 Shiva Prasad Bhattacharya 32, 33,
 34, 35, 38, 40

- Sic* 183
Siddha-śaila 231
Siddhacandra 254
Siddhanātha Vidyāvāgiśa 226
Siddhānta-śiromaṇi 255
Siddhāntasārvabhauma 255
Siddhāntasindhu 255
Siddhāntatattvārtha 255
Siddhas 46, 54
siddhi 89, 91
Siddhisthānas 284
Siddhiyoga 285
Sikdar 267
Simhagupta 285
simhāvalokana 246
Sindhu 22, 185, 186, 229
Sindhudvīpa 230
Sindhupuram 231
Sirajuddin Ali Khan 259
Sirr-ul-Akbar 258
Sītā 14, 15, 76, 77, 87, 88, 89, 91,
 95, 99, 118, 124, 127, 186,
 188, 189, 200, 206, 211, 226,
 244
Sītā- svayaṃvara 86
Sītārama Kavi 67
Sītya 183
Skanda 141, 238
Skandaputras 141
Smṛtis 285
Smaraśatrusūnuḥ 68
Smarārātisutaḥ 68
Smarārisūnoḥ 69
Snātakas 79
Snātra 183
Solor 231
Somadeva 162
Somaprabha 162
Somatirtha 87, 117, 123
Somnath 267
Spain 227
Sphoṭa 8
Srinagar 266
Srinivasacharya 146
Stambha 25
Sūrat 231
Sūrata 183
Sūri 179
Sūrimantrakalpasāroddhāra 180
Sūryapura 231
Sūryasiddhānta 250
sruc 80
Stecherbasky 41
Stein 30, 266
Sten Konow 26
Sthāṇvāśrama 205
Sthāman 183
Sthāvaraka 151, 152
Sthāyī 11
Sthāyibhāva/s 10, 11
Sthiradeva 236
Sthūlabhadra 224
Striceli 183
Subala 211
Subhāṣitamuktāvalī 187
Subrahmaṇya mandira 230
Sudakṣiṇā 70, 94
sudakṣiṇāsūnuḥ 70
Suhmadeśa 230
Sultan Mahmud 250, 266
Sumaśara 183
Sunandā 126, 243

Sundara 232
 Sundaravana 227
 Sundarī Paiyalacchī 282
 Sundareśa 214
 Sunnat 258
 Surabhi 79, 109
 Surapāla 286
 Surat 190
 Suravarman II 30
 Suruci 43, 45
 Suśruta 175, 284, 285
 Sutikṣṇa 43, 44, 45, 73, 77, 85
 Sūtrasthāna 284
 Suvarṇagiri 231
suvarṇas 138, 139
 Suvela 230
 Svāhā 97
Svapna/Svapnavāsavadatta 159,
 163, 164, 165
 Svargaloka 205
 Svayamvara 114, 126
 Svīyā 266
 Switzerland 227
 Syānandūra 215, 230

T

T. M. S. S. M. Library 202
 Tāḍakā 109
 Tahqiq Ma Lil Hind 251
 Taj 189
Tājaka 259
 Talinatā 182
 Tamāla 54, 210
 Tamasā 76
 Tāmrāparṇī 203, 209, 211, 229,
 230

Tāmrayavanas 33
tanayo'si girīśagauryoḥ 70
 Tañjā Nagara 203
 Tanjore 202
 Tansen 254
 Tantras 283, 284
tanuvṛttamadhyaḥ 114
tapasiddhi 92
 Tapagaṇapati 190
 Tāpasa/s 96, 164, 165, 166
Tāpasavatsarāja 160, 162, 163,
 164, 166
tapasvins 95
tapasvinyā bhāgadheyāni 123
 Tāpī 231
 Tapovana/s 71, 77, 165
 Tāra 182
 Tārā 188
 Tāraka 70, 111
Tārakavadha 70
Tārakavijaya 70
 Tārksyalakṣmā 182
 Tathatā 22
tatrabhavān 96
 Tejas 243
 The Date and Place of Origin of
 the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* 38
 The Date of the *Bhāgavata*
Purāṇa 40
 The Date of the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* 38
 The Philosophy of the
Yogavāsiṣṭha 38
The Purāṇa text of the Dynasties
of the Kali Age 167
The Vinaya Pīṭaka 167
 Thirupam 253

- Tikuri 219
Tilaka 165
tīrthadvāṅkṣa 247
tīrthakāka 247
 Tiruvalla 230
 Tiruvancikkul 231
 Tiruvancikkulam 230
 Tīṣata 285
Tithitattva 239
Toḍarānanda 254
 Todarmal 254
 Trailaṅga Vajranātha 222
 Trailokyamohana Guhaniyogī 184
 Travancore 212
 Tray 138
 Tretā 72
tretā 138
Trikāṇḍaśeṣa 281
Trikaṇāmātilakam 212, 230
 Trilocana 225
 Triprangor 231
Tripurāntakātmajam 68
 Tripurāri 69
Tripurāriputram 69
Tripurārisūnum 69
Tripurāsūrarī 69
Trirūpakōśa 282
Trīṣaṣṭīśalākā-puruṣaccarita 162
 Trivandrum 204, 205, 212, 215,
 230, 231
 Triveṇī 227, 230
Triyāmāramaṇaḥ 69
 Tṛṇabindu 86, 109
tṛṇajālū 237
 Tryūṣaṇa 182
Tuhfatul Hind 259
 Tukārām 253
 Tulasī 210, 225, 226, 239
Tulasīdūta 225
 Tuṇḍirapradeśa 230
 Tuṅgabhadrā 203, 209, 229
 Tuṅgilā 231
turaṅgamedha 77
 Tūru 182
Tuzk-i-Babari 260
 Tvaṣṭṛ 114
- U
- Uccaṇḍa 181
 Udaipur 221
 Udaya 203, 214
 Udayana 157, 158, 159, 160, 161,
 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167,
 168
 Udayana as a Historical Personage
 168
 Udayana Vatsarāja 157
 Udbhaṭa 11
Udbhaṭasāgara 257
 Uddaṇḍa 203
 Uddaṇḍa Kavi 202
 Uddhava 217, 218, 219
Uddhavadūta 217, 218
Uddhavasandeśa 217
Udvaha 181
 Ugrasena 220
 Ujjain 164
 Ujjayinī 52, 116, 164, 178, 186,
 229
Ujjvalanīlamanī 17
 Ullalana 181
 Ullāpya 12

Ulloca 181
Ulūla 181
Unmādavāsavadatta 162, 168
Unnihilisandeśa 215
upākhyānas 43
upāṅga 283
Upaniṣads 24, 34, 173, 258
Uparūpakas 12
Upayati 181
Uragapura 229, 243
Urasa 181
Urdu 260, 261
Ūrubhaṅga 16
Urvaśi 89, 98, 110, 112, 120, 121
utpalas 55
Utpalinī 281
Uttara/Uttararāmacarita 15, 19,
 24, 25, 34, 39, 66
Uttaratantra 284

V

V.B. Athwale 41
 V. Raghavan 36, 38
Vacā 145
Vācaspati 281
vadhū/s 150
vadhyapālikā 138
Vādicandra 187
Vāgbhaṭa 285
Vāgdevatā 207
Vāhikas 7.
Vahīnara 161
Vahni 169
Vaidyajīvana 285
Vaidyaśāstra 283
Vaijayanī 281

vairāgya 43
Vairāgya Śataka 21, 22, 24
Vairasimha 179
vaitāna 78
vaitānā vahnayaḥ 78
vaitānikam śāntyudakam 78
Vaitaraṇī 227
Vākātakas 37
Vakil 260
Vākovākya 283
Vākyapadīya 21, 22, 23, 34, 35,
 40, 175
Valaja 183
Vallabha temple 232
Vallabhācārya 221, 222
Vallabhadeva 236
Vallabhagrāma 230
Vālmīki 13, 15, 18, 28, 29, 30, 32,
 42, 43, 44, 45, 86, 88, 89, 91,
 95, 99, 116, 118, 127, 188,
 206
Vāmamārga 222
Vāmana-bhaṭṭa/Vāmana Bhaṭṭa
Bāṇa 209, 210
Vaṃśīdhara/Vaṃśīdhara Miśra
 253, 256
Vana 182
Vanajyotsnā 18
Vaṅculā 232
Vāṇmaṇḍanaguṇadūta 225
Vāṇmayī 231
Varadanātha 210
Varāha-purāṇa 239
Varaṇā 232
Vārāṇasī 189, 190, 209
Varatantu 74, 94, 97

- Vardhamāna 189
 Varkala 232
 Varṇa 183
 Varṇata 30
 Varuṇa 13
Vaśā 183
 Vasanta 128
 Vasanta Ramachandra Nerurkar 236
 Vasantaka 167
 Vasantasenā 139, 142, 143, 146, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152
 Vasantatilakā 28
Vasati 183
 Vāsava 167
 Vāsavadattā 157, 158, 159, 160, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167
 Vasiṣṭha 13, 32, 42, 43, 44, 45, 50, 75, 78, 86, 90, 92, 93, 94, 95, 97, 99, 101, 127
 Vāstika 178, 179
 Vasubandhu 22
 Vāsudeva 204
 Vasvaukasārā 192
Vāta 286
Vātadūta 188
 Vātāpādrī 192
 Vāṭapādrī 231
 Vatsa 158, 161
vatsa te bhāgadheyāni prccha 124
 Vatsagotra 209
 Vātsalya 11
 Vatsarāja 157, 164, 165, 166
Vatsarājacarita 168
 Vātsyāyana 265
 Vāyu 243
 Vazappilli 213
 Vedāṅgarāya 253, 255, 282
 Vedānta 211, 212
 Vedānta Sūtras 37
 Vedāntavādins 33, 34
 Vedāntins 33, 34
 Vedas 34, 169
 Vēdi 71, 73, 80
 Vegā 230
 Vegavatī 211
 Vekkattunar 231
 Vemabhūpāla 209
 Veṅkaṭācala 210
 Veṅkaṭācārya 202
 Veṅkaṭanātha Vedāntācārya 210
 Veṇuvana 157
 Vetravatī 73, 95, 229
 Victoria Terminus 227
 Vidarbha 122, 243
 Videha 53
vidheḥ 127
vidhi 121
vidhibalāpekṣī 127
vidhiḥ 126
vidhinā 81, 126, 127, 128
vidhiniyogena 122
vidhivaśād 126
vidhivat 81
 Vidiśā 186, 229
 Vidudabha 161
 Vidūratha 22
 Viḍūṣaka 146, 147, 148, 151, 159, 165
 Vidvatsadas 203
 Vidyālaya 208
 Vidyānātha 228

- Vidyāpati 259
 Vidyāraṇya 20
vihaṅgāvalokana 246
vihārahelāgatibhiḥ 68
 Vihārapurī 232
 Vihāras 151
 Vijaya 188
 Vijayanagara 230
 Vijayapura 229
 Vijayapuram 187
 Vijñānabhikṣu 34, 35
 Vijñānavāda 22
 Vikadrū 210
vikaṅkata 80
 Vikrama 110, 221
 Vikramāditya 228, 281, 283
Vikramorvaṣīya 120, 121, 136
 Villarvattam 203
 Vimānasthāna 284
Viṇā/Viṇāvāsavadatta 101, 162, 163, 164
Vinaya piṭaka 283
 Vinayaprabhu 200
 Vinayavijayagaṇi 179, 190
 Vindhya 49, 209, 229
 Vindhyācala 229
 Vindu 183
 Viṣpalā 283
 Vira 13, 103
 Viraka 146, 147
 Virahakāvyas 225
 Vireśvara 225
viśāda 10
viśakṣminyāya 248
Viśamaśarāreḥ 69
viśavṛkṣanyāya 248
 Viṣṇu 33, 53, 202, 223, 231, 285
 Viṣṇubhakti 220, 223, 224
 Viṣṇudāsa 223
Viṣṇudharmottara 285
 Viṣṇuśarman 137
 Viṣṇutrāta 213
Viśvā 183
 Viśvajit 75, 79
 Viśvāmitra 74, 76, 78, 80, 85, 86, 87, 95, 96, 97, 98, 284
 Viśvanātha 11, 12
Viśvaparakāśa 281
vitāna 78
 Viṭṭhala 216, 257
Vivādārṇavasetu 213
vivarta 21, 22, 23, 34
Vivekacūḍāmaṇi 21, 36, 37
 Vopadeva 285
 Vraja/Vrajabhūmi 207, 217, 219
 Vṛddha Vāgbhaṭa 285
 Vṛṣabhādri 230
 Vṛṣapurī 231
vṛṣaskandhaḥ 114
 Vṛkṣācala 211
 Vṛkṣāyurveda 286
 Vṛnda 285
 Vṛndādevī 210
 Vṛndamādhava 285
 Vṛndāvana 17, 189, 201, 202, 209, 212, 217, 218, 219, 222, 223, 227
 Vṛtrāsura 205
vyāṅgya 8
 Vyāḍi 271
vyāghārīta 138
 Vyāghrapāda 214

vyāghrapāda 246
Vyākaraṇa/Vyākaraṇaśāstra 8
Vyaktiviveka 7, 9
vyāñjaka 8
Vyāyoga 13
vyūḍhoraskah 114
Vyuṣṭa 183

Y

Yaśaskara 32
Yaśaskaradeva 30, 31, 32
Yādavaprakāśa 281
yāga 79
yajamāna 169
Yajamānaśiṣya 72
Yajamānas 81
yajña 71, 78, 79
Yājñavalkya 285
yajvan 75
Yājnyas 81
Yakṣa 16, 109, 110, 111, 112,
 115, 126, 170, 171, 177, 204,
 206, 209, 228
Yakṣī 113, 115, 184, 204
Yama 11
Yamakakāvya 228

Yamunā 207, 209, 218, 219, 223,
 247
Yaśodā 220
Yaśodharmadeva 228
Yāpyayāna 182
Yaqub B. Tariq 250
Yāska 269
yathāvat 81
yathāvidhi 81
Yaugandharāyaṇa 157, 158, 160,
 162, 163, 164, 165, 167
yaugapadya 8
Yavanas 33
Yayātinagarī 230
Yodhapura 190, 231
Yoga 212
Yogācārya 142
Yogasūtras 251
Yogavāsiṣṭha 20, 258
Yogavāsiṣṭha Rāmāyṇa 42, 43
Yogavāsiṣṭhasāra 27, 36
Yūpa 76, 77
Yudhiṣṭhira 222, 223
yugavyāyatabāhuḥ 114

Z

Zamorin 203



THE AUTHOR

Born on 29th September, 1930, Professor Satya Vrat Shastri had his early education under his father, Professor Charu Deva Shastri. He received record marks in B.A. Hons. in Sanskrit and a First Class First in M.A. in Sanskrit from the Punjab University, and won University Medals. After doing his Ph.D. at the Banaras Hindu University he joined the University of Delhi, where during the forty years of his teaching career he has held important positions as the Head of the Department of Sanskrit and the Dean of the Faculty of Arts. He was also Vice-Chancellor of Shri Jagannath Sanskrit University, Puri, Orissa. He has the distinction of having been visiting professor in five universities on three continents. He has attended and chaired a number of national and international conferences and seminars and delivered more than a hundred lectures in universities in Europe, North America, Southeast Asia and the Far East.

At Present he is Honorary Professor at the Special Centre for Sanskrit, Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi.

Both a creative and a critical writer, Prof. Satya Vrat Shastri has to his credit in creative writing in Sanskrit three Mahākāvya of about a thousand stanzas each, one Prabandhakāvya and three Khaṇḍakāvya, and five works in critical writing including a pioneering one, *The Rāmāyaṇa—A Linguistic Study*.

He is the subject matter of seventeen theses for Ph.D. and D.Litt. degrees in Indian Universities.

He has edited two research journals the *Indological Studies* and the *Śrījagannāthajyotiḥ* of which he was the founder, three felicitation volumes and a dictionary of the Sanskrit Words in Southeast Asian Languages.

He has translated A.A. Macdonell's *A Vedic Grammar for Students* into Hindi, the Sanskrit Mahākāvya the *Śrīrāmacaritābdhiratnam* into English and the select poems of the prominent poets of the world into Sanskrit.

He is working presently on a multi-volume Sanskrit Mahākāvya on the principal cultural currents of the world.

Recipient of fifty-two honours and awards, national international, including Padma Shri and four Honorary Doctorates, he was described in the Citation for the Honorary Doctorate at the Silpakorn University, Bangkok as a 'living legend in the field of Sanskrit'.



YASH PUBLICATIONS

X/909, Chand Mohalla,
Gandhi Nagar, Delhi-31

ISEN 81-89537-10-5

